

# AMERICA

## A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. L. No. 8  
WHOLE No. 1261

November 25, 1933

PRICE 10 CENTS  
\$4.00 A YEAR

### CONTENTS

EDITORIALS—Note and Comment.....	169-173
TOPICS OF INTEREST: What Price Recognition? by Leonid I. Strakhovsky—Giovanni Papini, the Convert by Alfred Schnepf, S.M.—Paramount Presents the Cloister by Gerard B. Donnelly, S.J.—In Behalf of the Mother-in-Law, Anonymous	174-180
SOCIOLOGY: A Patron for the Working Man by Augustine Smith.....	180-181
EDUCATION: Teachers for the Religious Course by Bakewell Morrison, S.J.....	181-182
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF by The Pilgrim.....	182-183
LITERATURE: The Unpopularity of G. K. Chesterton by J. Desmond Gleeson.....	184-185
BOOK REVIEWS...185-187...COMMUNICATIONS...188-189...CHRONICLE ...	190-192

### Constitution vs. Constitutional Law

THE head of the Recovery Administration has many qualifications for his post. But we wish that he would not discuss questions of constitutional interpretation, for as often as he indulges in it he weakens his position. He is not at home in that field, and he never appears less at home than when he attempts to debate with James M. Beck, member of Congress from Pennsylvania, former Solicitor General of the United States, and the author of several books on the Constitution.

Just at the present moment, possibly with an eye on the next Republican campaign, Mr. Beck is fond of asserting that we the people of the United States, once free and independent, are living under a dictatorship. Mr. Beck can cite verse and chapter for his opinion, and finds many to agree with him. In his address at Chicago on November 6, Administrator Johnson stated that his ears had grown tired of Mr. Beck's "screaming." It was not difficult to answer Mr. Beck's arguments, he said, since they were, one and all, founded on a misstatement of fact. We have no dictatorship in this country, argued the Administrator, or if we have, it is a dictatorship created by Congress. But that, precisely, is Mr. Beck's contention. To him, any sort of dictatorship is repugnant to the Constitution, and he thinks it incumbent upon the Administrator to show that under the Constitution the only dictatorship permissible in the United States is one that has been created by Congress. The point has been stated by Mr. Beck, and by others, on various occasions, but it has always escaped the Administrator's notice.

Dr. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton, a respectable authority in political science, approaches Mr. Beck's problem from another—and slightly cynical—angle. To him, the constitutionality of the recovery legislation "is simply

a question of the capacity of the Constitution to absorb a Revolution." Most observers of the American scene will probably agree that the swiftly moving events of the last six months, ushered in by a period when members of Congress voted for bill after bill which they had not even read, much less discussed, are equivalent to a revolution. Has the Constitution been able to "absorb" that revolution? If so, has the operation been fatal?

Dr. Corwin answers with a distinction which to some at least does not leave much left of the Constitution. The main question, he thinks, really has no connection with the Constitution itself, but with the interpretations of the due-process and inter-State-commerce clauses of the Constitution which have been written by the Supreme Court. Thus, what we must appeal to as the proper rule and standard is not the document itself, the Constitution as written, but to the "constitutional law," which he defines as "a body of doctrines which has been developed by the Supreme Court, in supposed interpretations of the Constitution." When the leading provisions of the recovery program are tested by the constitutional law, they will be found, Dr. Corwin concludes, wholly constitutional. In any event, "constitutional law provides a double set of answers for most important issues, and the constitutionality of the NRA depends upon whether this particular Supreme Court will approve of it."

Constitutions certainly grow, as we in this country have good reason to know. The additions to the Federal Constitution since the Civil War are so many and so wide in their implications that it is quite probable that the Framers of 1787, were they to return, would not recognize their work. Under the inter-State-commerce clause and the general-welfare clause, a whole mass of legislation has grown up to create a centralized Federal power which Hamilton, no friend of State sovereignty, confidently pre-

dicted could never be created. In theory, at least, all this legislation is in harmony with the letter and the spirit of the original Constitution. Practically, however, it has negated the purpose of the original Constitution, the very heart of which was the balanced powers between the several States and the Federal Government, all sovereign in their respective spheres.

Constitutions grow. They necessarily grow. Often they grow into instruments which bear small relations to the original papers. These facts are too plain to be denied, and no serious student denies them. But it is folly to assert that the new document differs in no whit from the first, and attempts to bolster up the statement by reading into the original document meanings which it cannot possibly bear may be extremely hurtful to good government. If the recovery program succeeds, let us be frank enough to admit that it has taught us the need of a new Constitution. If it fails, then let us—if we can—go back to the document of 1787, and live up to it. That is something we have not done for more than half a century.

### Progress of Liturgical Arts

IN the classic of Paul Claudel, *Le Père humilié*, the blind Pensée de Coufontaine asks the searching question: "But you who *see*, what have you done with your Light?" Now that the pioneer days of the Church are ebbing in the United States, Catholics are asked if we have the ability to translate our inward vision into the language of visible beauty.

In the latest number of *Liturgical Arts*, Michael Trappes-Lomax describes the passionate disappointment of the famous convert and contemporary of Newman, Augustus W. N. Pugin, that he could not accomplish this in his time. He was driven almost to madness, until his death from overwork at the age of forty, by the discrepancy between the grandeur of Christian dogma, the sublimity of Catholic worship, and the tawdriness that prevailed. "Cheap magnificence, meretricious show . . . something pretty, something novel, calico hangings, sparkling lustres, paper pots, wax dolls, flounces and furbelows, glass cases, ribands and lace, are the ornaments and materials usually employed to decorate, or rather disfigure the altar of sacrifice and the holy place."

The extraordinary response which has been given to the Liturgical Arts Society since its formation proves the depth and the extent of the feeling existing on the part of the clergy of this country, and the laity associated with them in their works, to abolish such discrepancies as may have lingered with us since the days of Pugin's great reform. To give but a single instance. The Society recently set up a service by which opportunity is provided for silversmiths to use their talents on behalf of the Church. The interest shown in this service has been astounding. "Several thousand dollars' worth of sacred vessels have already been made through the Society's Service, and inquiries concerning the work are coming in almost daily from all parts of the country." Besides this,

the Society publishes the superb magazine just mentioned; arranges for exhibitions; plans lecture series for schools and seminaries; and offers awards for certain types of meritorious work. Information as to building; requirements of the Liturgy, and questions of taste and esthetics fall within the Society's scope. Once a moderate working capital is secured, the activities of the Society will be largely if not wholly self-supporting: a firm basis to the liturgical revival in the United States.

### The A. P. and Russian Propaganda

AT this writing the conversations with the Russian envoy are dragging along, with apparently many of the outstanding questions still unsolved. One of these is said to be the necessity of a prior agreement concerning Russian propaganda in this country. Now Russian propaganda differs from all other foreign propaganda, it cannot be too often repeated, by the fact that it is not directed against this or that policy of this country, but against the country itself and against its Constitution. It is no answer to this that it may not be making much headway at present; it is making headway, and the future is more important than the present. Meanwhile, another question leaks out from Moscow as causing a division of minds at Washington. It concerns the Russian attitude toward religion. The President is represented as putting this attitude among the matters to be discussed before not after recognition, and in this all right-thinking Americans will applaud him.

This question, however, suddenly assumes a close connection with the propaganda question. The astute Litvinov could easily retort to the President that he will give up everything that is desired on propaganda, and, in an aside, remark that Russia need not carry on propaganda for Russia, that Americans are carrying it on for him, and as proof of that produce, if necessary, an Associated Press dispatch from Moscow on November 15, to which the *New York Times* gives the head "Religious Freedom in Russia." The A. P. correspondent said: "The Soviet Government and the Communist party have long since abandoned the militant suppression of all religion." This is a misstatement of fact and nobody knows it better than the A. P. propagandist himself.

As proof of that but two facts need be adduced. The first is that it is forbidden on pain of death to teach religious notions of any kind to all children under the age of eighteen, the surest way to suppress all religion, and if not a militant way it would be hard to imagine one. The other fact was brought out by the news that eighteen Catholic priests were released from prison in Russia in exchange for political prisoners in Lithuania. One of the prisoners released was a Bishop, who said that 100 Catholic priests are still in prison, kept there for no other reason than their profession of religion, while more than 2,000 Orthodox priests suffer the same fate.

No militant persecution of religion! What would the A. P. apologist for Russia demand? And where were the directors of the A. P., to allow such an outrageous piece



to pass? It was not a news dispatch in any sense. It was a calculated defense for Russia, it was false, and it was written in a purely editorializing vein. Litvinov need not worry about the stoppage of propaganda.

## Federal Liquor Control

**A**LTHOUGH the Twenty-first Amendment has been adopted, and will shortly be formally ratified, the control of the Federal Government over the traffic in alcoholic beverages is still very extensive. The old power of Congress to levy an excise tax, exercised from the Government's first days, remains unchanged, and the Administration is relying on it as an escape from higher taxation in other quarters. If the plans proposed by the distillers and brewers looking to a control of the traffic under the Recovery Act are adopted, we shall have a second source of Federal authority. Finally, the Amendment itself vests in the Government a considerable share of the authority which it possessed under the old Prohibition Amendment. Taken collectively, these three sources of authority suffice to establish a high degree of Federal control.

In the enthusiasm and relief that followed Utah's adoption of the new Amendment, some have forgotten that either by constitutional provision or by statute, twenty-nine States still remain bone dry. This legislation may be repealed, or at least modified, in some of the States, but if the stories sent out from Washington by the old-line Prohibitionists are true, a determined campaign will be waged to prevent any alterations. Moreover, plans have been formed to make this legislation more drastic in the dry States, and to introduce it gradually into other States. Should success attend these efforts, we may possibly have more real Prohibition after 1934 than we did under the old regime. In fact, should the temper of the day give rise to another Wayne Wheeler, alert, forceful, suave, and unrelenting, we may yet have a Prohibition that is not a fiction of law, but a hard fact.

Repeating the purpose of the old Webb-Kenyon Act, the second section of the new Amendment authorizes Congress to stand guard at the gates of every dry State. This means that when any State chooses to forbid the importation and sale of alcoholic beverages, it becomes the duty of the Federal Government to enforce this State legislation. If this section is to be taken seriously, the Federal Government will be obliged to watch over every distillery, brewery, and similar establishment through the United States to prevent illegal inter-State shipments, and must maintain a new "Rum Row" fleet off the coasts of North and South Carolina, and of every other State which, despite its proximity to the sea, remains incorrigibly dry. Since these duties must be undertaken and exercised by the Federal Government, a certain mystery attaches to the speedy dismantling of the old Federal Prohibition Bureau. As this Review pointed out when the Twenty-first Amendment was submitted to the States, that fatal second section gave the Government an authority which could easily be cited as justification for a larger

Bureau than the Government had even during the most piping days of Prohibition. Have the politicians at Washington decided to scrap the old machine, and build another for their own henchmen? Or is it their purpose, for the time at least, to decline to enforce the second section?

Certainly, the section will not enforce itself. But if Washington remains inert, the borders of every dry State will soon be swarming with smugglers and bootleggers, not one of whom will pay a penny in taxes. The respective States are struggling with the problem of enforcement, but Washington seems to be lying back at ease. Not long ago, it made a sweeping reduction in the civil-service employees connected with the Treasury Department, although the places of some of these men were later taken by employees who probably think that civil service has something to do with etiquette. When is the first thin line to set out for the dry borders? Or is the second section to be allowed to drop into innocuous desuetude, on the ground that too much vigilance might bring up unpleasant memories? Whatever the answer, it is to be hoped that this second section will not follow the Eighteenth Amendment as an example of what happens when the Government is fettered to a measure it is either unable or unwilling to enforce.

## Candidates and the Newspapers

**T**HE chief purpose of a political campaign is to give the voters an opportunity to know the issues of the election, and the character of the candidates. A campaign is a kind of novitiate. The candidate applies for admission; he states his qualifications; the people pass judgment upon them, and admit or reject him. Unfortunately, perhaps a majority of the people must depend for their knowledge of the candidate, his qualifications and his views, upon the reports and political comment published in the daily press.

If the press undertook to report all the candidates fairly, with no discrimination against any, it could be of very great service. The fact is, however, that with scarcely an exception, the press selects its candidate, and for the rest of the campaign, he is the petted darling. If this selection were merely the expression of a preference, the case would be tolerable enough, but, as a rule, the candidate's opponents invariably come in for very rough treatment. Their virtues, if they have any, are passed over in silence, while their faults are magnified out of all proportion. And it has not been unknown in the heat of a campaign, that a newspaper, otherwise noted for fair dealing, will stop just short of the libel law in its direct comments on a political opponent, and go far beyond the limits of the law in stating indirectly what would put its editor in jail if stated openly.

Probably the press never sank to a lower pit of unfairness than in the recent municipal election in New York. As an election in New York is news for the rest of the country, this unfairness was reflected in newspapers in many of the larger cities. Thus in a special article,

published some days before the election, the Chicago *Tribune* presented a picture of the Democratic candidate for Mayor which could have been true only of a frowzy and illiterate individual whose acquaintance with the business of the city was not even elementary. The *Tribune* correspondent took his information from the New York press; it could not possibly have been based upon any real knowledge of the candidate (and present incumbent) the Hon. John P. O'Brien. Not only has Mr. O'Brien, considering the difficulties, not of his own making, which he has been obliged to meet, given the city of New York a good administration, but he is the one candidate who conducted his campaign in every respect like a gentleman. Dignified, kindly, and charitable throughout days of bitter strife, he never said a word that could wound, or that even the most sensitive could resent. His reward from the press was abuse and misrepresentation.

It is not our contention, of course, that the press was bound to support Mr. O'Brien. But it is regrettable that it could not free itself from bitterness and rancor to share the kindness and the perfect sportsmanship of Mayor O'Brien. If ever we need a free press, free particularly from mean and lying partisanship, it is during a political campaign.

#### BULLETIN

### Russia Is Recognized

**A**FTER this issue was on the presses, word came that the President and M. Litvinov had exchanged notes tantamount to the recognition of Soviet Russia. The presses have been stopped and the later copies of this issue contain this early comment. The letters between the two statesmen have just been published and it is too early, naturally, to present an adequate comment, but certain reflections are possible.

It is at once evident that the opinion of the largest part of our people has prevailed, that recognition should be preceded, as far as possible, by previous settlement of as many outstanding questions as might be. This is a procedure that was followed by no other nation in recognizing the Soviets, but its prudence should be apparent at once.

Furthermore, the Soviet Government, though it has not done what this Review demanded, that is, dissolve the Third International, has in fact nullified its effect in this country, and if our interpretation is correct, has completely broken the link which binds the Communist party in this country to its parent in Russia. No organization, which even "indirectly" depends on the Russian Government, may carry on propaganda here which is designed to bring about a violent change of our form of government.

But this is not all. M. Litvinov was led by the President to bring out from their obscurity certain decrees of 1918 concerning religious liberty for those who come into Russia from without, decrees which, if we are not mistaken, have been observed more in the breach than in the fulfilment. It is obvious that Mr. Roosevelt could not demand that Russia grant religious liberty to its own subjects, but he did the next best thing. The little lecture

he reads M. Litvinov on liberty in this land will not be lost on the Russian people, if it is allowed to appear there.

Needless to say, all those who have opposed recognition will still retain full liberty to oppose Sovietism.

### Note and Comment

#### Jesuits Don't Care!

**T**HE Protestant tradition is still strong in our English speech. That is why you can say extremely offensive things about Catholics, the Church, and her institutions, without even dreaming that your language is offensive. The latest example of this fact we owe to Administrator Johnson. "How he did it, I do not know," said the Administrator, referring to the success of the President's program, in a speech at Chicago on November 5, "I am enough of a Jesuit not to care," and Middle-West headlines featured the words. What the Illinois Manufacturers Association, 4,000 strong, which he was addressing thought of the allusion is not stated in the press dispatches, but many Catholics will take umbrage at it. The Administrator has somewhere heard that Jesuits are crafty folk who always get what they set out to get, because they do not care what means they use to get it. Offense was far from the Administrator's thought, and he will doubtless hear with surprise that his reference is only a tag manufactured by that stolid and stupid, but persistent, Protestant tradition, scored by Newman, which rates all Catholics as suspicious folk, but puts all Jesuits quite outside the pale. The trouble with General Johnson must be that he does not realize that any Jesuits are alive today. A trip up to Georgetown in his own city, or to a college or university in any of two dozen cities, would show him that there are lots of living people who do not deserve the epithet, opprobrious in the way he used it, though they are Jesuits in the flesh, an epithet, incidentally, which he applies, unjustly, we hope, to himself.

#### Inflation or Deflation?

**T**HE basic idea behind the propaganda for inflation of the currency, though never clearly avowed by its proponents, is that it is the only way they can think of to relieve debtors of the burden of their debts. It is undeniable that this burden in the present state of prices is what is holding back recovery by damming up the flow of new credit where it is most needed, particularly in the farming, public-utility, and transportation industries. It seems a simple thing to cut the value of the dollar in half, so that those who owe money will have to pay back only half of what they owe. The Governments of France and Germany did this after the War, and those Governments' creditors, the citizens who held their bonds, were the losers. The idea is to do the same here with private debts, including mortgages. It does



not seem to occur to these enthusiasts that among these creditors are the holders of life-insurance policies and of accounts in savings banks or any banks, and wage earners, all of whom are in the creditor class which it is proposed to wipe out. And still another objection has just been put forward. It is that inflation works an even greater hardship on the former debtors than it did on the creditors. Dr. W. S. Landis, of the American Cyanamid Company, pointed out that in Europe both Governments and private enterprises were forced immediately to undergo additional and larger borrowing to carry the added costs induced by inflation, and that the interest on the new debts is greater than that on the old; so that the last state of the debtors now is worse than the first. If new capital is to be released by dealing with debts, it is better to scale down the debts to a more reasonable figure in present circumstances than to destroy the basis of credit altogether. Many observers believe that the reason why this depression is more stubborn than others in yielding has been that large blocs of interests have resisted this deflationary process. If they are to save their investments these interests will have to consider very seriously whether it is not better to suffer a smaller immediate loss than to have a mass movement rise in the country which will wipe them out as creditors altogether by inflation.

#### Benedictine Builders

**A**N unqualified tribute to the need of Christian education for youth was paid by the Hon. John Garland Pollard, Governor of Virginia, at the dedication of the new trade schools of St. Emma's Agricultural and Industrial Institute, Rock Castle, Va., on November 4. "No man is strong enough to resist the temptations of life without a heart fortified by the teachings of Christianity," said the Governor, addressing Mrs. Edward D. Morrell, foundress of the Institute, which is for the education of colored boys. "And I heartily commend you for your efforts to inculcate religious teaching in the hearts of youth." The schools which had been blessed that morning by Bishop Andrew J. Brennan, D.D., of Richmond, were planned and built entirely by the Benedictine Fathers in charge of the school, assisted by the pupils themselves. In concrete, steel, and glass Father Frederick and Father Anselm have wrought with the skill and enthusiasm of the ancient builders of Subiaco or Maria Laach, or the modern restorers of Buckfast Abbey. The importance of this work was emphasized by the Mayor of Richmond, J. Fulmer Bright, who reminded his hearers that in sixty-five years the illiteracy of the Negro has been reduced from ninety per cent to twenty-three per cent. "In 1916 there were only forty-four high schools in America and 8,760 pupils. Today there are 209 of these high schools with an attendance of 164,000 pupils." The school was founded in 1895 by Colonel and Mrs. Morrell and comprises all of a stately old estate in Powhatan County, Va. The officials of the school feel that its nearly forty years of work have been

justified by the leadership that its graduates have assumed in the communities where they live and work.

#### Trail Marks of the Past

**T**HE zeal of a Presbyterian clergyman, the Rev. A. M. Stewart, of Rochester, N. Y., has led to the marking of the trails of the early Jesuit missionaries in Central New York State. On September 4, of this year, a tablet was placed to the memory of Father René Ménard, S.J., at the bridge dedicated to his name, on the State highway between Auburn and Seneca Falls, N. Y. (U. S. Route 20), recalling the fact that he was the first white resident (1656-1658) of the Cayuga country. Recently, on October 29, another tablet was erected, near Honeoye Falls, at Dann's Corners, in memory of Father Jacques Fremin, who founded the Jesuit mission at Totiakton in 1668, and his companions, Father Julian Garnier and Father Peter Raffeix. The group who promoted the building of this monument wished to give prominence, says Mr. Stewart in his historical sketch, not to war or trade, but to men whose characters show forth ideal qualities. Particularly striking was the tribute paid to the early missionaries by one of the very race that caused them so much anguish, the Rev. Michael K. Jacobs, S.J., a full-blooded Iroquois. In the very spot where the missionaries erected mission chapels in the westernmost Seneca villages of the Iroquois Confederacy between 1668 and 1700, Father Jacobs, speaking in Iroquois into the microphone, paid a glowing tribute to James Atondo and Francis Tehoronhiongo, two Huron prisoners of war and the first Indian preachers to spread Christianity to the Senecas. Then, switching to English, he expressed on behalf of his own people his gratitude to those men who were their "first fathers in God." The monument recalls particularly the memory of the Seneca Indians. The flourishing Indian missions of today bear witness to the depth with which that early seed was planted. For the Fremin ceremony a special debt of gratitude is owed to the Rev. Edward J. Byrne, D.D., of St. Bernard's Seminary in Rochester, N. Y., who was the moving spirit behind it, as he was of the Ménard dedication in September.

*A copy of the Index for Volume L of AMERICA will be mailed to any subscriber on application to the publication office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.*

#### AMERICA A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

WILFRID PARSONS  
Editor-in-Chief  
FRANCIS X. TALBOT  
FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN  
Associate Editors  
JOHN LA FARGE  
DANIEL BASSETT  
FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID  
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00  
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:  
Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
Telephone: MEdallion 3-3082  
Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.  
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW  
*Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.*

## What Price Recognition?

LEONID I. STRAKHOVSKY

**W**HETHER, by the time this article appears, recognition of Soviet Russia will have been granted or not, it is useful to cast up the balance sheet of that action, proposed, refused, or accomplished. The avowed purpose of the conversations that have taken place at Washington was the exploring of the possibility of normal relations. Let us examine these relations as they are probable. If recognition shall have been granted, we shall then know what we have to expect. If it is not, we shall have a probable reason for refusal.

Protagonists of recognition have told us of the tremendous benefits this country will enjoy once a Soviet ambassador has raised the red banner over the old Russian embassy in Washington. They have emphasized the enormous potentialities of the Russian market and endeavored to make us believe that Communism is just another ideology and that Stalin's dictatorship is just another form of government. They were almost ready to repeat the words of Lloyd George who, when criticized for concluding the Anglo-Soviet trade agreement of 1921, said: "England is trading also with cannibals!" But if we overlook our natural ethical scruples to accomplish our well-being through Red trade, shall we really benefit by it? Cannibals do not endanger the structure of the British Empire, but Soviet propaganda does. Should we not ponder over the fact that over 150,000 votes of American citizens were cast for the Communist ticket in the last presidential election? Should we not find it embarrassing to witness the strikes and disturbances in this country at such a critical moment? And should we not be warned by discovering that over seventy-five per cent of these have been sponsored by Red agitators? Should we not look into the experiences of other nations who did establish diplomatic relations with the rulers of Russia? After all, the experience of others is an indication of what we may expect ourselves under similar circumstances.

What do we find? Did not Rakovsky, Soviet ambassador to France openly incite French soldiers to revolt? Did not Arcos, the official Soviet trade agency in London, finance a Communist publication which brought about disturbances in the English navy? Was not the Soviet legation in Greece found to be a place where anti-Communists were murdered in cold blood? Did not Mexico expel the Soviet minister and his staff because of continuous and persistent propaganda on their part in a friendly country? Space is lacking to enumerate more instances. The Soviet government feels in no way bound to keep any agreement with any capitalistic country except where the benefit lies exclusively with the Soviet government.

If so, what are the guarantees that the United States and its citizens will be exempt from similar experiences? Defenders of Soviet interests in this country, either through malice or stupidity, claim that the Bolsheviks

have abandoned their quest for world revolution, that they have ceased to poison our minds by their insidious propaganda, that, in a word, they have become civilized. How can we believe them? Their leaders continue to rattle the revolutionary saber, their treasury still disburses subsidies to Communist parties in the United States and in foreign countries, and their propaganda machinery works as smoothly as ever.

The fifteenth conference of the Communist party of the Soviet Union went on record affirming that the "Russian Communist party is, was, and will remain the chief stronghold of world revolution." The program of the Third International adopted as a guide for all Communists (including those in the United States) at the sixth Congress, held in 1928, and still binding, concludes: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their goal can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions." And one of the resolutions adopted at the same Congress emphasized that the Communists of the world are preparing for a revolutionary war which "is but a continuation of their revolutionary peace policy, only by other means."

If this warning is not sufficient, if we are willing to risk a social revolution for immediate material benefits, let us investigate what these benefits are. We were told that 168,000,000 half-starved Russian peasants are ready to engage in a billion-dollar trade with the United States. We were told that the considerable drop in Soviet-American trade during the last three years is due to lack of diplomatic relations. But we are not told that the average citizen of the Soviet Union receives a monthly salary of 100 rubles and that, if he is not a Communist (and there are only 3,000,000 Communists in Soviet Russia) he has to pay twenty rubles for one pound of butter. We are not told that Soviet trade has dropped in all the markets of which the United States has, so far, been the least important. The following official figures speak for themselves:

	First Three Months		
	1931	1932	1933
	(in million rubles)		
Imports .....	251.2	192.1	88.4
Exports .....	195.9	144.5	112.1

In 1933, fifty-three per cent of the total imports came from Germany, notwithstanding the fact that Hitler held the reins of government.

In truth, the Soviet Government can shift its imports from one country to another, according to its political rather than its economic needs, due to the monopoly of foreign trade. Foreign trade can go to Germany today, to England tomorrow and to the United States next day, and can be used—as it has been used in the past—as a club or a gift to any nation that the Soviets wish to influence. Several times it has gone to England in



exchange for favors of one kind or another, and each time England has regretted it. If Soviet Russia can give her trade to the United States in exchange for formal recognition, she could have given it without that recognition. If she can profit by trade with the United States she could have sent it here whether or not she was accorded recognition. She has not done it, however, because it is to her disadvantage, because she cannot contract more liabilities without long-term credits; and long-term credits of the type desired by the Bolsheviks will not be given by private concerns without sufficient guarantees.

Of guarantees, Soviet Russia has none left. *Her gold output is in the hands of the Reichsbank* as a security for previous extensive loans. Her platinum output is not of sufficient volume to provide for payment of her imports. Then what security will the United States have for extending long-term credits to the Soviets? The paper ruble, maintained artificially at a ratio of fifty-one cents to a gold dollar, is worth barely six cents. The only way for the Soviet Government to remain solvent is to export to the United States "even at a considerable loss," according to the statement of Larin, a leading Communist economist. Can the United States permit the "dumping" of goods on her internal market? That market is already overflowing. Can the Government of the United States permit the benefits, if any, of Soviet trade to go to the steel and manufacturing industries when the reverses of this trade will hit the producer and consumer of commodities? Can the Government and its "experts" propose seriously to finance Soviet trade by means of a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, that is, with the money of the taxpayer with less guaranty of being repaid than a racing enthusiast has in placing his bet in the hands of a crooked bookmaker?

Some advocates of recognition stressed the argument that such an act would be beneficial to the Russian people and should therefore be executed from a purely humanitarian point of view. Do these advocates realize that the benefits will be derived exclusively by the Communists and not by the masses of Russian people in whom the Bolsheviks are not at all interested? Can any humanitarian point of view stand the challenge of cold facts?

Generations of Americans have been horrified by tales of exile in Siberia as practised in Imperial Russia. We compare the records and find: *During an entire century*, the Emperors of Russia sent into exile only about half the number exiled to Siberia by the Soviet Government *during one year*. Formerly, stories were circulated about the all-powerful secret service of the Emperors, but even the most exaggerated tales of the activities of a few thousands of the Secret Police fade before the ruthless methods of the hundreds of thousands of OGPU agents who use even small children to inform against their parents who may have withheld a portion of grain raised by the sweat of their brow.

When news of extensive famine in the most fertile parts of Southern and Southeastern Russia reached the United States, it was emphatically denied by the Soviet authorities. At present we have statements of American

journalists to the contrary. Ralph Barnes, of the New York *Herald Tribune*, has placed the death figure from actual starvation and illnesses incurred as a result of malnutrition at three millions; Henry Chamberlain, of the *Christian Science Monitor* of Boston and the *Manchester Guardian* of England, rates the number of dead at four millions; and Walter Duranty of the New York *Times*, who is certainly not unfriendly to the Soviet regime, estimates the loss at five millions of people.

In addition to these appalling statistics, William Allen White of the Emporia (Kansas) *Gazette* reports that these deaths from starvation were not the result of an act of God, but rather of a deliberate policy to punish those recalcitrant peasants who would not believe in the benefits of collectivization. At the recent London Economic Conference, Maxim Litvinov, already hailed by some overzealous reporters as the master diplomat, if not the master mind (with due deference to the mental capacities of the "boss"—Stalin), calmly admitted to an European diplomat that the sacrifice of fifteen to twenty million more people will be readily agreed to by the Soviet Government in order to transform Russia into a real Communist State. Can one talk of the humanitarian point of view when dealing with deliberate murder?

There is another group of "friends of Soviet Russia" who advocated recognition on the ground that such an act would help to preserve peace in the world and consolidate America's position in the Far East, in view of the growing expansion tendencies of Japan. Recognition of Soviet Russia does not mean peace. It means war. A pamphlet entitled "The Basis of Soviet International Policy," issued by the "Central Executive Committee of the Russian Communist Party" in 1933, only a few months ago, disperses the clouds of pacific oratory of Maxim Litvinov and sheds light on the *real* policy of the Soviet Union. It reads in part:

The task of Soviet foreign policy is to exploit the liberal and pacifist tendencies of certain groups of the bourgeoisie and of industrial circles interested in trade with the U.S.S.R., thus prolonging the breathing space and insuring an inflow of foreign credits, machinery, and materials for the industrialization of the U.S.S.R. For this purpose the U.S.S.R. energetically confronts the aggressive military plans of its enemies with proposals for the *present* to let both systems live peaceably together. (Italics mine.)

This is only a temporary measure, required by the anomalies of both systems. Soviet proposals for co-existence of these systems have already spread confusion among imperialists. We must politically exploit economic discords among our enemies. Discord between Great Britain and France was one of the reasons why France did not break with the U.S.S.R. in 1927, when Great Britain did. Soviet foreign policy remains based on revolutionary prospects abroad, and the Soviet Government therefore maintains constant contact with the foreign proletariat.

Is this not a sufficient warning to those who believe that the Soviet wolf has suddenly turned out to be a peaceful lamb?

It seems clear that the recognition of Soviet Russia by the United States Government will be beneficial mostly to the former. There is one unquestionable advantage, however, for this country in recognizing the Govern-

ment of Bolsheviks and that is that at last the Department of Labor will be able to ship back to their Communist heaven all those alien agitators who disturb the peaceful reconstruction work of the great American community.

Is this one advantage worth the heavy price that the people of the United States will have to pay one day for extending formal recognition to the present rulers of Russia?

## Giovanni Papini, the Convert

ALFRED SCHNEPP, S.M.

A YEAR or two ago there appeared a communication in American papers stating that Giovanni Papini, the great Italian writer, had renounced the Catholic Faith. This story found its way to America from France, and had its origin in a misinterpretation of one of Papini's books, in which he apparently made a very violent attack on religion. Unfortunately, those who started the story had the careless reader's habit of skipping the introduction, wherein Papini had been kind enough to state, just for the benefit of those who might misinterpret, that the views expressed in the book were not his own at all.

But even if this introduction were now permanently lost, the false conclusion arrived at by those who did not read it would find a perfect refutation in a recent article of Papini's. In it he takes issue with an old antagonist of his, Benedetto Croce. The latter, unwittingly of course, has rendered a service to Catholicism and also to the literary world similar to that rendered by Charles Kingsley of Apologia fame. By an unjust and unwarranted attack on Catholic converts in general (similar to Kingsley's on Catholic priests), he has elicited from Papini an account of the motives of his conversion. It is only to be regretted that Papini did not see fit to make a reply as detailed as Newman's "Apologia."

Before getting down to Papini's account, it may be well to say a word or two about the book which occasioned it, and to give in brief the first part of Papini's general criticism; for herein also we find superabundant proof of the great convert's sterling Catholicism.

Benedetto Croce, politician, writer, and Senator of the Italian realm, interests himself particularly in history at the present time. His first work in this field was on Naples; then he took in the kingdom of the two Sicilies; then the whole of Italy; and finally this very year he has written a "History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century" (just published in English by Harcourt, Brace). (As Papini very aptly remarks, we can next expect from him something to rival Wells' "The Outline of History.")

Croce's politics, as well as his religion, is what he calls "liberalism." He himself would probably have some difficulty in defining just what he means by this term. Suffice it to say here that he looks on the Catholic Church as one of the principal enemies of his system; he pays it the compliment of an attack, although the attack does consist largely of a belittling of her achievements in the past and of her influence at present, together with a prophecy of her speedy dissolution. Faced with a living refutation of this theory in the persons of the numerous converts that the Church has always made and continues

to make in the ranks of the intellectuals, he dismisses them with the remark that the converts of the romantic period were effeminate and imaginative, drawn to the Church by her "colors, her music, her songs, her old cathedrals, the images of the Madonna and of the saints"; while those of more recent date (during and after the War) are either weak and worn-out souls or else unscrupulous adventurers.

This last accusation was obviously what aroused Papini himself, and, in fact, it was probably intended principally for him, since he and Croce are adversaries of long standing. But before going on to see what he says in reply, let us comment a bit on his polemic method in general, as illustrated in the earlier part of his article.

In certain respects he reminds us of Chesterton. He deals the same kind of crushing blows, deeming almost no material unworthy of his purpose. He even picks on the physical peculiarities of his opponent to enliven his theme, and he has one sharp little paragraph in which he pictures Croce as a futuristic architect, going about town and deploring the ground taken up by Catholic churches and chapels, and then plodding his way home, "his little paunch sticking out, and his mouth twisted to one side."

He is willing to make fun of his adversary in other ways also. The very title of the article, "Mr. Croce and the Cross" ("Il Croce e la Croce"), is a pun on the Senator's name. He ridicules him and his pretensions by referring to him as an infallible little pontiff (*pontefichino*); as "Benedict I, Czar of all the Cultures"; and, with more wit and less crudeness, as a "bishop in *partibus infidelium*."

But this abuse is merely the fireworks to attract the crowd, or, at the best, to enlighten those who prefer momentary brilliance to a steady illumination. For those of a more serious turn, he has a searchlight which pierces to the depths of Croce's philosophy and discovers there a foundation of sand. But even here his refutation is not of the dry, theological type, designed rather to give a sense of satisfaction to those who are already convinced than to convince those who are falsely satisfied. He meets his adversary on a common ground. This ground he finds in the nature of man, an obvious truth of equal evidence to believer and unbeliever alike. He proves that man cannot adore his equal, man; that in a religion men demand something more than a mere intellectualism, something which will appeal to their imagination and to their emotions.

Coming then to the point which concerns him more closely, the matter of the converts, he gives proof of the



breadth of his culture and the extent of his historical knowledge by citing offhand the names of half a dozen converts (from three nations: Germany, France, and Spain) of the romantic period, together with the motives that brought them into the Catholic Church. For the present period he selects one example from each of the four leading nations of Western Europe: Rivière for France, Chesterton for England, Wust for Germany, and himself for Italy. In a paragraph or two he outlines the steps by which each of these was led to Rome.

With the first three we are not concerned here. As for Papini himself, it is, as he himself remarks, the first time he has told the story, despite much previous solicitation. In such circumstances, we ought to let him speak for himself; besides, a summary of his account is really impossible.

During the War, [he writes] and especially towards its close, I was deeply grieved at the sight of so much ruin and so many sorrows. In those years I reread many of the books of Tolstoi and Dostoievski, and from them was thrown back on the reading of the Gospel, which I had read several times but always in a diffident and hostile spirit.

While meditating on the Gospel, and especially on the "Sermon on the Mount," I came to think that the only salvation for mankind, and the one safeguard against a return of the horrors of the time, could be nothing else than a radical change in men's souls; the transition, that is to say, from savagery to sanctity, from hatred towards the enemy (and even towards the friend) to love even for the enemy.

Christianity therefore at first appeared to me in the light of a remedy for the evils of humanity, but, as I pursued my solitary and anxious meditations, I came to the persuasion that Christ, teacher of a morality so opposed to man's nature, could be no mere man, but God. And at this point there intervened, I believe, the secret but infallible workings of grace. And so strong was in me the love for this divine Teacher of love, that I decided to do something, so that His words might come also to those who did not know them, or who did not understand them, or who despised them.

And so I began to write, alone, in the country, impelled not by desire of gain or of fortune, but by a sincere need to help some of my brethren, the "Life of Christ." And when it was finished, there faced me the need of belonging to the society founded by Christ. And among the innumerable churches calling themselves his faithful interpreters I chose, not without internal misgivings and a certain repugnance which I have since overcome, the Catholic Church, whether because she truly represents the central trunk planted by Jesus, or rather because, despite the weaknesses and human errors of many of her sons, she is the one, in my opinion, which has offered to man the most satisfactory conditions for an integral sublimation of his whole being, and because in her bosom alone flourished abundantly and splendidly the type of hero that I esteem most: the Saint.

After pointing out how this direct statement gives the lie to Croce's accusation, he indicates even more clearly the primary motive of his conversion:

After my conversion, I have corroborated and strengthened my faith by new reasons, especially those of a historical and of a logical character, but the fact remains that the first impulse came to me from an overmastering desire to *serve* my fellow-men, to show them, in the best way at my disposal, my love for them.

Before embarking on this little apologia, Papini had, in a previous paragraph, given a few autobiographical details in the third person:

Let Mr. Croce know that in them (Christians) there arise,

although always solved and overcome, doubts about the foundations of their Faith; doubts about the possibility of getting to perfect salvation; insufferable pains at the coarseness or lukewarmness of the greater part of their new associates; and periods of dryness, disquietudes, and temptations of every kind. Anything but tranquillity and quiet for the indulgence of a hypothetical weakness! The Christian who is in earnest is in perpetual war and torment, and if anyone claims never to have experienced doubts and anxieties, let Mr. Croce be sure that there is question of a Christian torpid and slow, or else, at that moment, insincere.

And, in closing his article, Giovanni Papini showed that he himself has acquired the true spirit of Christianity when he asked pardon of Croce for any injustice of which he may have been guilty toward him in the past and ends with a prayer for his conversion; for, says he, "I have at least five reasons for loving him: because he is a man, because he is an Italian, because he is a scholar, because he is unhappy, and finally because he is an enemy. . . . Even antagonism creates a tie and obligations."

## Paramount Presents the Cloister

GERARD B. DONNELLY, S.J.

ONE of the most difficult tasks that a playwright could possibly tackle—at least if you consider the thing from the angle of pure theory—would seem to be to write a play about convent life. I mean, of course, a play that presents an authentic and undistorted picture of convent life and yet one good enough to attract cash customers to the theater and to charm and move them while they are there.

The reason for this difficulty is obvious. Theorists on the art of the theater keep insisting that the stuff from which the best and most successful dramas are made is pretty generally limited to three human cravings—the desire for personal dominance or power, first of all, then, the need for love (in all the various meanings of the word) and finally the crude and rather unlovely lust for money. One of these three impulses (I am still quoting the professors) is sure to be the driving force in nearly every hero or heroine who stalks the stage, and whether we go back to the tragedies of Macbeth, Romeo, and Shylock, or confine our attention to the current Broadway comedies, we are rather sure to find that the really successful play is concerned predominantly with what the Scripture calls the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life.

How then can a dramatist hope to whip up a popular play about nuns? The most obvious thing about them is the fact that they have vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Thus, their very rejection of the world, their deliberate denial of wealth and sex and self-determination cuts them off at once from the prime materials of drama and precludes all hope of ever presenting them as heroines on a stage.

This does not mean, of course, that the theater does not appreciate what might be called the pageantry of the Religious life. Productions as far apart in mood and purpose as Max Reinhardt's "Miracle" and Ziegfeld's "Showboat" have made most effective use of white-

habited nuns, gentle Mother Superiors, off-stage Gregorian chant, and the tolling of convent bells. But the point is that these are mere glimpses of convent life; they are introduced as background or atmosphere; they are quite secondary, being used generally as a setting for a romantic story which soon afterwards wanders far away from the sound of the voices in choir and the rattling of the rosary beads. "Marie Odile," that Belasco drama which caused such a furore among Catholics two decades ago, was not an honest rendering of convent life; and even the "White Sister" is primarily a love story in which the Religious vows are dramatically posed as an obstacle to a happy marriage. Indeed, as far as can be learned, there has never been a dramatist wise enough to see that there could be the materials for beautiful and deeply human drama inside the cloister walls. And until the plays of Martinez Sierra were translated into English, theater lovers suffered from the need of a playwright courageous enough to make a faithful nun the heroine of a play.

Catholics therefore—and not only Catholics, but all lovers of good drama as well—will be delighted with the Sierra comedy recently filmed by the Paramount Company and soon to be released for general exhibition. Despite the successful tour of "Cradle Song" through the midwestern theaters some five years ago with Eva Le Gallienne in the principal role, all too few people had an opportunity to enjoy it. The motion-picture version, featuring Dorothea Wieck, the young German star who rose to sudden fame in "Maedchen in Uniform," is beautifully done and will fully make up for their loss. Indeed, this reviewer can go much farther than that in his praise. "Cradle Song" must be certainly the most human and touching picture that Hollywood has turned out in the past year, and very probably the loveliest.

Such praise may seem to have the ring of the press agent and the advertising layout about it. But this Review, which has had occasion all too frequently in the past to condemn the ugly obscenities and the vicious ethics of the films, hastens to recognize an honest endeavor on the part of the producers to do a picture free from the smirch of sex. And when it discovers in addition that this effort has resulted in a film of extraordinary beauty and charm, it has allowed me to proclaim that fact to its readers with more than ordinary enthusiasm.

Surprisingly, in view of the fact that it is a convent story, the essential theme of "Cradle Song" is motherhood, or rather the sacrifice of motherhood. This, of course, is no place to summarize the plot, save to say that it climaxes in a deeply moving farewell scene between a community of nuns and their ward, an orphan girl whom they have reared from infancy. Here, the dramatist implies, is a tragic parting to be experienced and endured by every mother of a child, a bitter sacrifice which every woman at some time in her life will be called upon to make. It is not a new theme, obviously; it has served as the basis for dozens of novels and plays in the past. But by lifting the story from its usual well-worn setting and laying it in a convent, and by the extraordinary device of making the mother in his drama

a consecrated virgin rather than a wife or widow, the author has contrived to universalize his tale of maternal love and to sound depths of poignancy in it that have never been touched before. What he has dared to do, in fact, is to put a Religious habit on Everywoman, an ingenious trick that beautifully underscores the unselfishness and sacrifice of true mother love and at the same time endows his story with marvellous tenderness and appeal.

The Paramount organization, it is pleasant to report, has handled the Sierra drama with understanding and sympathy. This might have been expected, seeing that the job of preparing the play for the screen had been put into the competent hands of Marc Connelly, author of that memorable comedy, "The Green Pastures." To him and to the film's director there must go most of the credit for what is really a remarkable bit of insight and stagecraft, for these two men have succeeded in grasping that elusive quality that can only be described as the color and feel of the convent. They have not only understood this accurately, but by some sort of wizardry they have rendered it on the screen. All the small humors of community life are in their film. The peculiar eagerness of the novices, the amusing timidity with which they address their Mistress, the pontifical air with which the Vicar pronounces her views on nothing in particular, the harmless little exemptions to Holy Rule that the Superior grants on important occasions and the very human sigh of relief with which they are welcomed, the tiny clashes of temperament, the controlled curiosity, the mass fright over a small accident, the youthful flutterings, rustlings, swishings, and giggles and yet the peace and purity that shines like a light in every angle of the convent—all these things belonging to the very warp and woof of cloistered life, they have somehow contrived to get into their film. Doubtless this is due ultimately to the genius of Martinez Sierra himself. Yet in adapting this play to the screen, a process which usually means spicing it up for popular consumption, they have not permitted a false note to make an entry. (Unfortunately, one brief passage of dialogue in the second or third reel, not more than one or two lines, however, will prove offensive. But in all honesty this is the only feature in the entire film to which good taste could possibly object.)

It might be well to add this final remark: When AMERICA clamors for clean pictures, it is not necessarily advocating the production of Catholic or of religious pictures. What this Review has insisted upon is that all films, no matter what their subject matter—whether football, marriage, Park Avenue heiresses, or consecrated nuns—should be ethically right, that is, that they avoid unhealthy and immoral theses and be free from obscenities. "Cradle Song" happens to be a magnificently Catholic picture; but much more important than its crucifixes, chapels, and charming nuns, is the fact that it justifies a morally wholesome view of life. It is for this second reason, even more than for the first, that this picture is welcomed, recommended wholeheartedly, and wished wide popularity and financial success.



## In Behalf of the Mother-in-Law

ANONYMOUS

**A**RE mothers-in-law people? I maintain that they are, and that they are not fiends incarnate whose chief diversion is the tearing of loving young hearts asunder.

Being a mother-in-law myself, I resent the role we have to play in contemporary literature. I am tired of being the villain of the piece. And having waited in vain for someone to champion our cause, I have at last determined to take up the cudgels myself.

I wouldn't care a fig for all this anti-mother-in-law propaganda if it didn't do real harm. That it does do harm I know, because I have first-hand knowledge of it. And friends of mine whose children have married all say the same thing. The natural and pleasant relationship that ought to exist between us and our children-in-law has been poisoned by all these dire warnings against us.

I looked forward eagerly to my children's marrying, as I believe all mothers do whose own married life has been completely happy and satisfying. I felt no qualms about whom they would marry. I believed then, as I do now, that children brought up in happy, congenial homes develop an instinct for picking the right mates, just as they develop naturally along other lines.

My two daughters-in-law are attractive, sweet girls, and my son-in-law is a fine boy. All three marriages are completely happy, thank God. I could love my in-laws for that alone, since most mothers desire their children's happiness above all things.

But I need not love them for that alone. I could love them for themselves—because they are charming and amusing and good. I would like nothing better than to love them—if they would only let me!

I am fond of young people—some of my best friends are the age of my children. Before my sons were married, they used to bring their various girls home to dinner, and my daughter always had the house overflowing with beaux. I was accepted as one of the crowd in those days. I have always felt immensely pleased and flattered that young people do seem to like me.

One son became engaged to a girl I had entertained frequently. I knew her well—I had thought she and I were real friends. I was so delighted with my son's choice. When she suddenly became formal with me, I believed at first it was from shyness or strangeness in the new relationship. I exerted myself to the utmost to make her feel at ease, to welcome her into the family. I made no headway whatever. My friendly overtures were met with reserve and suspicion. At last it dawned on me. I was a mother-in-law!

Gone was our old, frank friendship. It grieved me to the heart to see this sweet, young girl treating me so guardedly, so warily. Why? I asked myself over and over again. In heaven's name, what did she expect me to do to her? How could she believe that I would try to come between her and my son? Does a mother bring up her children tenderly, lovingly, only to set about deliberately contriving their ruin?

The same change came over the two that my other children married. These friendly young people changed overnight. I had become their traditional enemy.

I believe I am not possessive. I haven't a scrap of desire to dominate or to run the lives of others. Even if I had, I know perfectly well that the day of the dominating parent is over and done with. I never tried to dominate my own children. I have always maintained that I would never live with my married children. Therefore I was completely bewildered and baffled by this show of hostility. I had done nothing to deserve it. My mother-in-lawhood had thrust it upon me.

After the first shock I realized that there was no use sitting home and feeling martyred. I would have to win back these former friends of mine. And I believe I have finally done it. But it was a long, hard pull. It took infinite patience and tact. Sometimes I felt as though I were beating my head against a stone wall.

Everything I said was misconstrued. There were times when I would have given ten years of my life to recall some remark spoken thoughtlessly but which was given some ulterior meaning by these suspicious young people. If I said casually that I had tried to ring them up the night before, and where were they, I could see my daughter-in-law stiffen and grow cold. "Ah ha!" she seemed to be saying to herself, "trying to check up on us! Well, I won't give her any satisfaction." And she would answer me guardedly. Sometimes I could hardly resist crying out, "You silly child! I won't hurt you! Treat me like another human being!" But I knew that would have been fatal. I merely added one thing more to the already exhaustive list of things a mother-in-law must not say.

I read an article the other day about an interfering mother-in-law who insisted on telling a young wife how her son liked his toast. Though the article was bitterly denunciatory, my heart bled for that woman. I have made such mistakes—mistakes that set me back months in the task of winning my in-laws. Though the poor woman was tactless, I feel sure she was well-meaning. She thought her daughter-in-law would welcome the information—as, indeed, she would have from any other source! It's not what we mothers-in-law do that counts against us—it's the construction that is put on our actions.

This false construction is directly traceable to the anti-mother-in-law propaganda with which our newspapers and magazines are filled. Books and plays are written about us. How can the young people escape it? It's not their fault—they, as much as we, are the victims of it, for I believe that they can derive as much profit and pleasure from a mutual friendship as we can.

Occasionally a woman will try to wreck her children's marriages. Occasionally the father of a large family will become a maniac and murder all his children. Are we constantly warned against fathers? Are we told to watch them for signs of insanity? Do we tremble when father picks up a breadknife? Do we fly shrieking from the house when he takes down his gun to clean?

I maintain that home-wrecking women are no more sane than the maniac fathers. They are trying to kill some-

thing that they've nurtured tenderly for years. If that's not insanity, what is? Why should such women be considered any more typical than the maniac fathers?

Someone has said that any one of us who was considered insane would have a difficult time proving his sanity. But

that's the position we mothers-in-law are in. We have to serve a long and difficult apprenticeship to prove our sanity. I consider that grossly unfair. I believe we should be judged sane until we prove ourselves otherwise. I believe we should be treated as human beings.

### Sociology

## A Patron for the Working Man

AUGUSTINE SMITH

THERE is a popular song going the rounds nowadays which declares that "you never see a headline about a breadline today." It's true; you don't. But that does not mean that we have come out of the dark forest of our national economic crisis. The President himself estimates that there are still several millions of men out of work. Their lot is none too happy, and it bids fair to be less so as winter draws on.

Add to this the sad fact that there is widespread discontent among workers in many parts of the country. The farmers are dissatisfied, industrial strikes are breaking out. All in all, we are still a long way from an economic Utopia, and even further from a workers' Utopia. The President is surely doing his part, but he needs help. It is not amiss, then, to suggest that the people of our land turn to a patron who will not only help them, but will aid the President in his heroic task.

This patron was a man who was one of us—of our time, knowing its problems and its pains. He died a martyr's death in Mexico City but five years ago. His name is Michael Augustine Pro, priest of the Society of Jesus.

When one speaks of Father Pro, many people will doubtless recall only the gruesome pictures of his execution which were sent to the press by the Mexican Government to show what happened to "criminals" who disobeyed the anti-religious laws in force in that country. Michael Pro's only offence was that he was a Catholic priest.

But there are other elements in Father Pro's life which will bear examination, especially his relations with the ordinary workers who never experienced a "new deal" in anything, and with the unemployed and the destitute. Father Pro made it part of his life to be the friend of such unfortunate ones. This article, then, may serve as a brief commemoration of his death, for he was executed on November 27.

If Father Pro is canonized, he will not be a saint that will appeal to the fastidious and the puritanical. During his lifetime he did not hesitate to talk slang, or put on overalls and mingle with the workmen he wanted to help, or even make "wisecracks." Yes, he would call them just that, if he were alive today. He was in many ways a comedian whose joking overlay an intensely religious nature. Probably that is one reason why he was a favorite with working people. He never got "mushy" about religious things. In fine, he was everything that a plaster-of-Paris saint is not. And emphatically he will never be

a saint for those who demand their holy men pale and dour.

Michael Pro was the son of a Mexican mine owner. As a child, he delighted to go down into the mines and talk to the workmen. He actually loved them. I am afraid he would never have been a go-getter in the business world, for he spent more time in thinking out ways to help these people than in planning how he could make more money out of them.

After he became a Jesuit, he was sent to study abroad, on account of the internal difficulties in his own country. He returned to Mexico just as the persecution began. At once he was faced with two problems, practically the same two problems that confront the United States today—economic and religious. The economic structure of Mexico was undergoing a terrific strain and people were out of work or were paid such low wages that making both ends meet became almost a feat in legerdemain. In addition, there was the problem of Bolshevism and Socialism to combat. These two specious systems had intrigued many of the workers, and were leading them in droves from the Church.

It was then that Michael Pro showed his genius as a social worker. He knew that no man is in fit condition to make retreats, or even to be approached on the question of religion, if he hasn't a reasonable amount of bodily comfort. As he himself wrote of these poor people: "They are true sons of Adam and Eve; they live in houses and have to pay rent; they wear clothes which become adorned with holes; they know how to get sick and they want to be cured." And many of them needed things to eat.

So nothing daunted, Michael Pro, dressed in layman's clothes (he had to evade almost continually the secret police) set out to feed and care for a multitude, and strange to say, he succeeded. Some days he looked like a huckster, with a bag of vegetables or a couple of live chickens trussed up, taking supplies around. At other times, he would arrange raffles and rummage sales, and use the proceeds for his poor.

He finally put his charities on a grand scale, and had quite an organization at his command. He trained his men and women volunteers not only to find out where help was needed, but to become adepts in the art of getting money from those who had it, in order to give it to those who hadn't.

In the meantime he was receiving mail at four different addresses in order to evade the police. He had been



arrested once, but they could not prove he was a priest for the simple reason that they did not know who he was. At this time he was engaged in giving retreats under the very eyes of the officials.

His retreats were especially dear to him, notably those for men; taxi drivers, mechanics, and the like. Upon one occasion he gave a retreat to some taxi drivers, fellows who, as he wrote, "can spit marvelously out of the corners of their mouths, but really lads of true gold, in spite of their somewhat rough and unrefined exterior." He ends this letter with the fervent wish that "God may bless all the taxi drivers in the world." When he gave this retreat, it was in a large yard, probably behind a garage, and he was dressed in a mechanic's "jumper" and rubbed elbows with his "congregation."

Upon another occasion he gave a retreat to some Government employes, free-thinkers, Socialists, everything, "afraid of nothing, not even the devil." They gave him quite a run for his money, answering their objections against religion, for he says he "had to sweat" but was amply rewarded by seeing the whole lot of them go to Holy Communion at the end of the retreat.

Finally, he could escape no longer. He was caught by the police, accused of a crime he could not possibly have committed, and he and his brother, along with two others, were "railroaded" to their death.

Now heroic though Father Pro's martyrdom was, his secret lies deeper than that. He is worthy of being remembered, as has been said, for his apostolate of the poor, the suffering, and those who were generally down on their luck. The secret of his success with people was that he understood them and loved them. And he understood and loved the people who so seldom get love and understanding in this world—the laboring class, the unemployed, and those who by reason of their discontent and desperation are tempted to reach out to grasp the straws of Bolshevism and Socialism.

Father Pro went among them as man to man, first relieving their economic difficulties, and then winning them back to the Fold from which they had strayed. And he had that other great qualification for a social worker, a sense of humor. But he was no Pollyanna.

And so I offer him as a patron for the man who works or wants to work for a living. He understands just what that man is facing, and it is reasonable to suppose that he is just as interested in that man as he was in his miner friends in Mexico when he was a boy.

According to all reports he is, as so many holy persons are, more powerful in death than in life. And so I am going to make a very personal appeal to everyone who reads this article. The appeal is this: ask Michael Augustine Pro to help this country in the crisis she is still facing. Ask him to help the workers of this country, that they may benefit by the New Deal. We still need help—lots of it.

Father Pro was what all the political parties claim to be—the friend of the working man. He will not fail his old friends now.

## Education

### Teachers for the Religion Courses

BAKEWELL MORRISON, S.J.

I HAD been at Sodality conventions and I had heard there many dolorous things about religion teaching and religion teachers. I had read AMERICA and sworn softly to myself (and to the Editor) over the things that were printed about "providing teachers for religion courses." I was in the right mood, then, when an appointment came to me as Director of the Department of Religion.

I went to bed anxious about an interview which I was to have with the Dean on the morrow on this very subject. I remember phrasing conciliatory and deprecatory expressions which, I thought, would surely mollify him and render him an abject slave to my whims and fancies and rather rigorous requirements for teachers of the courses which were to be given that semester.

\* \* \* \*

There was a knock at the door. The Dean had come to see me, anticipating my descent on him. He was brandishing the proofs of the "Schedule of Courses" in his hand.

"Well," said he, "let's see whom we will assign to these religion classes."

I peeped at the copy, and saw that while all the other subjects were made out in full with topic and instructor neatly noted, the religion classes had the topic, but no instructor. I began timidly. "Well, I have been inquiring about, and there are several men besides myself who have indicated a desire to teach religion this semester."

"Yes," said the Dean. And without stopping, he went on, "Now, there's Father Blithri. I simply have to give him more teaching. Of course, if I do he will probably complain most bitterly, even to an authority higher than me. And he will miss a good many classes, too; he is so forgetful. However, put him down for these two courses."

I gasped. My anticipations were all too truly being fulfilled.

The Dean went on, "Then there's Father Meningitis. The So-and-so Department refuses to have him teach more than six hours. I just do not know what to do with him. Better put him down for those next two courses. And, well, if Father Scarletina takes those two courses—the dear old gentleman feels so badly if he is left off the list of teachers—then, I think, you will be able to handle the rest. There, that's that!"

"But," I started to object, "there are these other men who expressed a willingness and even a desire to teach religion."

"No," said the Dean, quite positively, "they are very heavily loaded already. Their departments think highly of them. We must not interfere with their efficiency."

And then—there was some sort of a noise outside my room. . . . The Brother calling his *Benedicamus Domino*. It was time to rise!

Why (it gradually penetrated my consciousness), I had been having a dream. "Well," said I to myself, "the reality cannot be any worse than the dream." And I rose to a rainy day, myself more bedraggled with the clammy horrors of my dream than the soot-streaked outside.

Later on in the day I met the Dean. The "Schedule of Courses" had not even got as far as the galley stage. He welcomed me, waved me courteously to a seat, and when we were both smoking, he said: "We are going to have a bit of a struggle getting the right men into the right courses. Depression, you know, has put us on short rations in the matter of faculty. But—well, this institution is founded on a principle. We must bring the blessed Christ into the minds and hearts of these young men; and for that our best teachers are not too good.

"So I have arranged that each of the outstanding teachers will take one course each. They will find it an outlet for their apostolic zeal. Of course, I understand that it is going to require work on their part to prepare these classes. That work is recognized in the amount of other teaching that is given them. You are the only 'full-time' teacher of religion; but with this help from the best of our staff, you'll be able to manage it?"

It was a pleasant little preachment. If one were ever justified in falling on a Dean's neck and weeping tears of sheer love and joy, I would have felt moved to that happy, but unmodern, method of showing him my gratification.

I did tell him of my dream.

"Yes, I know," he said. "And I had a tussle with myself between the needs of the various departments and the needs of your own. But there is only one possible answer—the answer I have given."

\* \* \* \*

So much for interviews.

There are objections to having an instructor spend only an incidental part of his time on a subject. There are difficulties in the way of a mathematics professor turning a nimble intellectual somersault and dropping his logarithms to take up his Denzinger for a moment. But the difficulties are more apparent than real.

Granting that the normal course in dogmatic and moral theology, with Scripture and Church history and other what-nots thrown in, does not automatically and fully prepare a man to grapple with the growing mind of youth in its religious aspirations and struggles and problems, and thus does not at once fit a man perfectly to teach a college religion course, still a priest or a Religious does not really care to forget that the Master asks of him (and her) that they be directly and in fitting measure "about their Father's business."

It will help to keep one young—this mingling with the minds of the adolescent in the business of their Faith. It will help to remind the otherwise too distracted mind that all things have relevance where the Faith is concerned. It will keep before the mind's eye of the follower of Christ the vivid memory of the "one thing necessary."

Even, it might be hazarded, the teaching of a religion course along with an otherwise absorption in profane or

classical studies will react favorably on the spiritual life of the one so engaged. Meditation, Mass said—if one be a priest—and at any rate, Mass heard, spiritual reading, the Breviary, other prayers—all these can be saved from the deadening effects of routine, can be brightened and made fresher by the fact that each week the teacher spends some time in preparing and some time in teaching the eager and absorptive minds of Christ's beloved youth the mysteries of the Faith.

General Foch thought the time spent before the Tabernacle time not wasted. Matt Talbot taught only by the singular deepness of his burning love of Christ, which was hidden from the eyes of men and came to light only really on his death. The Little Flower never preached or taught classes outside her monastery.

Yet these were not teachers by profession. They were only teachers in so far as the Christian—every Christian—is a light set upon a candelabrum. The Religious or priest who is a teacher by profession remembers undoubtedly that there is an indirect apostolate. But, they surely remember, too, the ringing words of Paul, "How shall they hear if there be none to preach to them?"

Zeal a teacher must have if he is to teach religion properly. Intelligence, too, is required and in ever-increasing measure as our youth grow mentally more and more and, too, more and more are coming to find "difficulties" where in a simpler civilization (such as that led by our forebears before the radio, and the auto, and the talkie, and airplane, and electricity, and advertising, and the insatiable thirst for reading material had artificialized our lives) such difficulties were things unknown. But the Religious or the priest who is a teacher in a college or university really can hardly afford to lose all contact with his intellectual "searching" and loving study of his Faith. He cannot rely on his former courses in theology to carry him triumphantly over all that the "world" suggests to him as difficulties against his Faith. He must study. He must not commit the utter and miserable fallacy of thinking that he at least learned his Faith once and for all, and can now afford to let it vegetate.

Thus, even for one's own advantage, it is a happy proposal when the Dean says, "Father (or Brother or Sister) will you take this course in religion this semester?"

### *With Scrip and Staff*

THE question of how to celebrate the downfall of Prohibition on December 5 came quite naturally from talking about Hilaire Belloc. "I appreciate the point made by E. J. S. in his communication to AMERICA for November 18," said Father Jude, as he poked his pre-Thanksgiving log fire, "to the effect that Belloc would be more convincing to skeptical scholars if he quoted chapter and verse. But the difficulty is, will people buy and read his books, as they do, if the pages are cluttered up with references? And he wants, apparently, people in general to buy and read them.



"Until Prohibition came in," continued Jude, after we had made the transition from Hilaire to hilarity, "I preached voluntary—not scruple-ridden—abstinence as a matter of course. This is a Catholic idea; just as moderation is a Catholic idea. But under Prohibition, any talk of total abstinence compromises you. Now that liberty has returned, the prerogatives of liberty come back with it. If you are *free* to enjoy the experience of using drink you are free to have the experience of not using it; and you can pledge yourself to this latter experience without placing either yourself or your neighbor in a false light."

With sinking heart I inquired what might be his proposal, for Jude seemed to me to be flouting Divine Providence. "I am counseling nothing about beer and light wines," he replied. "God knows there are few of us who do not need some such mild stimulus in these dark days. My parishioners do, if none others. Who can drink flagons of iced beer, anyway? But where is the harm in man's pledging himself, in gratitude for the end of Prohibition, to celebrate its downfall by a year's abstinence from hard liquor and cocktails? Mind you, no harm either in the other, as his devotion prompts him. But can't a man revel in a bit of abstinence, too, if he thinks he can do it gracefully? We have shown that we shall not let the fanatics boss our personal habits in the line of use. Then may we not declare our independence of the implications they brought on Catholic asceticism in the matter of non-use? In short, let each man be free to go to God in his own way? I think your John Wiltbye man would agree to that. And after the year is up you can re-chart your course. It's a *celebration*, not a vow."

"Jude," I replied, "you are discomfiting; but there may be the germ of an idea in what you say." Did it have anything to do with the large placard that adorned his church vestibule?

SPECIAL Thanksgiving Sermon  
Thursday, November 30

**D**ISCUSSION of the Buchmanites, or so-called Oxford groupists, leads the London *Tablet*, for September 30, 1933, with various kindly reservations as to what might be said in favor of the movement for non-Catholics, to see no possible advantage in it for Catholics. Certain objections, the *Tablet* notes, are "never squarely faced and clearly answered."

Like "Christian Science," Buchmanism in practice is a movement for the well-to-do. If any reader of these lines has met any poor Groupists, his experience has been different from ours. . . . There is far more of the Big Business spirit than we would like in this fast-growing brotherhood of mostly well-to-do persons which publishes no balance sheet of its huge revenues and its not very frugal traveling expenses. . . . We do see in it dangers of subjectivism, of spiritual pride, of arrogance towards humbler brethren, and of an ultimate disillusion which may have to be called by a harsher name.

An Anglican, Douglas J. Wilson, Ph.D., professor of psychology at the University of Western Ontario, passes a still more severe judgment on Buchmanism in the *American Church Monthly*, for November. The name

"Oxford Group" Dr. Wilson rejects as a snare and a delusion. The "four absolutes—honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love," which feature in the Buchman program, he dismisses "immediately as being impossibly ambiguous under the complicated social system in which we live, though admitting of course that genuine fortification in these qualities is essential in the surrendered life." The "sharing" process (open confession) leads naturally to self-complacency and various abuses, for which public confession was done away with in the early Church. The "guidance" idea resolves itself into mere "hunches," some of which foster irresponsibility and social misdemeanors. "Group leaders were 'guided' to break important engagements while large gatherings of people sat waiting in confused ignorance. . . . A three-year-old reported that 'He (God) said, you must eat porridge in the morning.'"

Dr. Wilson's final indictment of Buchmanism, however, is its lack of social implications.

Based as it is on a reclaiming of the individual, there is no program offered of social reconstruction. Society is to be remade by changing single units. It is true that we may expect greater honesty expressed perhaps in a return of conscience money, as a result of these changes, but what about glaring injustices and impossible economic set-ups that are wrong in principle? Under present systems, if *every* life were changed we could expect barely tolerable conditions. We have reached a place where a gospel without a social corollary of a corporate nature is plainly an anachronism.

Or plainly contrary to genuine Christian and Catholic tradition. Dr. Wilson's words are an indictment of revivalism in general. And may not Catholics as well be on their guard against accepting without qualifications the all-sufficiency of individual regeneration?

**I**F Buchmanism, limited as it is, can appeal by its power getting laymen to their feet and making them testify to their religious convictions, surely Catholic Action, with its infinitely more varied and social program, must be vastly more effective in winning popular support. How effective it can be is seen by the success of Ciscora, the Chicago Catholic Student Conference on Religious Activities, which traces its origin back to the Eucharistic Congress in 1926, and was the first Catholic student federation of its kind in the United States.

At the meeting of Ciscora in the Loyola University Downtown College on October 14, Marcelle Slocum, Rosary College chairman of the Catholic Social Action committee, observed:

The average student is apt to think that the cause of Christ is confined to our personal lives and actions, to the Church and possibly to literature. He does not see so clearly that the cause of Christ extends into every department of life, personal and social, private and public. . . . To bring home to our students the truth of Christ's social reign and to show him practically how to bring it about, is the objective of the Catholic Social Action Committee.

The Liturgy, the Prayer Life, Retreats, and Devotion to Our Lady, are, with Social Action, some of the divisions of Ciscora's program. With these practical projects to work out, neither Buchmanism nor other 'isms can hold much attraction to Catholics.

THE PILGRIM.

## Literature

### The Unpopularity of G. K. Chesterton

J. DESMOND GLEESON

WHEN G. K. Chesterton is dead—and, please God, the calamity shall be delayed for another generation—one special phrase will be used by those who write the notices of such events. Phrases are, of course, kept ready for occasions of this sort. Labels are hastily brought out and pasted over the corpses of old careers. I know as well as if I could already see them what notices will be used for G. K. C. After the usual faint praises, something like this will run, "In spite of this, that, and the other, Mr. Chesterton failed to fulfil his early promise."

That will be the invariable note the public mourners will strike. They will shake their heads sadly over this lost promise and sigh that it was not made good. Nevertheless, they will be completely wrong. G. K. C. has given more than he ever promised to give, but he has not given what some people would like to have had from him. The difficulty was not in the giving, but in what was given: not in the promise itself, but in the understanding of what was promised. I think a correct understanding of this peculiar position is interesting in itself and also enlightening. Moreover, it goes a long way to explain what one must call the unpopularity of G. K. C. in his own country.

When Mr. Chesterton first came into prominence, first bounced up from those dark depths below, he was greeted with a special type of praise. The critics were impressed by the curiosity of his style. They said, "What an extraordinarily vivid, personal manner this new writer has of saying things!" They spoke entirely of *how* he spoke, of how quaintly, or even grotesquely, he expressed himself. They were struck by something new and amazing about the fashion of his speech. They never knew what startling phrase he would use next, what shattering image would be thrown before their eyes. A new conjurer of words had come into their world, and they knew not what to do about it. In their desperation they called him "brilliant" and declared roundly that he was full of promise.

What they did not trouble about was *what* this new person was saying. They were willing to allow that he had a message, if only they were not troubled to find out what it was. It was the manner of the newcomer which appealed to their imagination, but that the manner merely covered vital matter, was more than they were willing to understand.

In the end they had to turn from the manner to the matter, and then the critics experienced a slight shock. Mr. Chesterton was not saying what they wanted him to say. He was not repeating all the smart nothings like the rest of the "brilliant" boys of his day. He was not coining empty epigrams in the fashion of the 'nineties, or shining with a decadent light over a particular night world of his own.

He was saying very sensible things about the world and its ways and (O reckless prophet!) saying that justice should be had, even by poor people. He was saying that

men should be free, that slavery was abominable, that life was worth living, and also that religion was a necessity to mankind. And he was advancing new and arresting arguments in favor of these old ideas. The freshness of the world affected him as it had affected Whitman, and he led a wandering, or rather straying, people back to the singular notion that "grass is green."

Now if he could look upon this last statement as a staggering epigram, but essentially an untruth, the critic would no doubt have been greatly impressed and rewarded Chesterton with a bright future. Indeed, while he could conveniently consider that the writer was not concerned to tell the truth, but merely to amuse him, the critic, he did permit Chesterton to be a lad of much promise. But when he saw that with G. K. C. the truth would out, whether it led up the critic's street, or up a particular street that he abhorred, then there began that shaking of heads and that questioning of whether all was well with a fellow who so steadfastly refused to be "modern."

But as Chesterton was interested in eternal things, the gig and jumble of fashions appealed to him only as a joke. He would not be serious about frivolous things; which is a very serious crime against popularity. The truth was that he was a little bit ahead of fashion. He saw the new movements coming before they actually appeared and knew just where they would end. He made no pretense to be in the swim, having a personal preference for firm ground under his feet. Moreover, he was consistent. Like the great Dr. Johnson, he could give an argument to his critics, but he could not give them an understanding and, lacking that, they could only feel that he was not keeping pace with his original promise. All the time, of course, he was developing in the only way he had ever promised to develop and moving rapidly towards his real destination.

It is only when one considers what G. K. C. might have been that one realizes how great he really is. He might have been the king of the novelists, whose new character studies of psychological development kept him in the front rank, and first in that rank, season following season; and how boring that would have been! He might have stuck to belles-lettres, living in a world of the past, and only coming out of it at meal times. In this remarkable world you can picture him playing gravely with the bones of the dead, patting forgotten skulls on the head, setting some up in neat rows and knocking others down with gloomy gestures. You can imagine a fearfully learned gentleman engaged, and profitably engaged, in these antics, but it is difficult to imagine that gentleman being G. K. C. Again he might have become an eminent poet, whose verse made contact with the millions in the street or, on the other hand, with the small handful of precious mortals who carefully avoid both the streets and the millions. He might have been crowned with the laurels in England, enjoying an official position and following one success with another. But he preferred to be himself. Is it hardly to be wondered that his critics were annoyed or that his popularity suffered?

Sadly it must be confessed that he took no advantage of passing moments, used no great occasions for his own



ends, made no corners in any special literary products. He was content to go on his own way rejoicing, merely fighting any other man who stood in that way or contradicted what he was saying. In the old days there were a few who had not learned the wisdom of leaving him alone. When Chesterton trailed his coat, as was his provocative habit, these few had the hardihood to stamp on it. A fight would ensue, after which G. K. C. would continue on his way, but with a new scalp added to his collection. But that, I say, was in the old days. Today men are more prudent. They decline to pick up the challenge. Chesterton is just as provocative, just as dogmatic, just as downright in his statements, just as contradictory in his methods. But now there are no fights because it takes two to make a quarrel, and men are not to be found courageous enough to defend their opinions against G. K. C. It is much safer to ignore him, and the publicists prefer safety first. That is their best way to preserve their reputations. But what a pity the fighters are gone! What grand combats we have missed! In that sense, certainly, G. K. C. is wasted.

The last, and also, perhaps, the first gladiator whom Chesterton met was, of course, Bernard Shaw. But it is hardly realized what was G. K. C.'s achievement in this case. It was Chesterton who set the limits on Shaw. Before his coming, Shaw was the Superman himself. He was a law unto himself. There was nobody to match him in deadly debating skill, or, for that matter, in any sort of argument. Any man who had the temerity to go out against Shaw went out to be slaughtered. Whether the point were general or particular, whether it concerned the philosophy of life or someone's special study, it was fatal to come up against Shaw. He could say what he liked and get away with it. Then, out of the unknown, came the huge Chesterton, and Shaw was faced immediately with an opponent worthy of his steel.

It so happened that on most points of intellectual interest these two fighters found themselves on opposite sides. In a general way Shaw was on the side of the moderns, while Chesterton was on the side of humanity, which is neither modern nor ancient. The two clashed. They continued so to clash for about thirty years, but what came out of the struggle was simply this, that Shaw discovered what were his own limits. There had come up against him a man whom he could never slaughter, whose debating skill was equal to his own, and whose philosophy was founded on general truths. Shaw might no longer say what he liked and get away with it. He began to have to watch his words with a novel caution. His dogmatic conclusions, which had routed many an opponent, were suddenly shown to be not so conclusive after all. His wall of hard facts was pierced with a ruthless logic and left in a sad state of repair. Chesterton gave blow for mighty blow, and generally wound up with the last blow.

Thus you see how Chesterton has failed to "fulfil his early promise." He failed to follow the crowd. And as if to prove it and to show his resolute determination not to be popular at any price (literally, at any price), he set the seal on his own willfulness when he joined the

Catholic Church. He had never promised to do that, even in the wildest of his youthful days. He had never led his critics to expect that he would end up in that manner, and they really did conclude that Chesterton had purposely misled them. There are some crimes that even critics cannot forgive.

But if you care to examine Chesterton's career with a mind less prejudiced than theirs, you will probably come to the conclusion that the Church was the real goal to which he was heading all the time. There is a natural development about that career and a natural humility about the man which lead to the headquarters of Christianity, with many a pleasant stop by the wayside for drink and good-fellowship.

This conversion was not effected in the dark. It went on for a number of years in the full light of publicity. It was to be traced in the succession of articles and books, which made the critics shake their heads over the original promise and mutter a despairing "brilliant!" And the whole business went forward with such good humor and good argument, such a feast of wit and riot of jokes that it was a capital entertainment as well as an open-air lesson. When it began, Catholics were rather a suspected body, but before it has ended they already seem a much more tolerable, if not human, crowd. In short, Chesterton's joining of the Church was much more than his joining up. It was a private happening, but it was also a public event. It was the fulfilling of a promise that the author was too modest ever to have dreamed of making.

#### REVIEWS

**The Universe of Light.** By SIR WILLIAM BRAGG. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$3.50.

A surprising part of the growth of physics has been due to studies of light. Ranging from astrophysics to electrons, quanta, and waves, they have resulted in both a vast amount of technical knowledge and in theories that intrigue some laymen while appearing as nonsense to others. In these studies, Sir William Bragg is an acknowledged leader. So we may trust him when, with simplicity, charm, and well-chosen pictures, he tells the story of our knowledge of light and the experiments by which it was gained. One first is surprised that such an abstract subject may be so simply treated; then he is pleased to find the amount of real, comprehensible knowledge that lies behind current speculations. The book is a pleasant relief to the physics of Jeans, and a notable volume of popular science. C. L. F.

**A Century of Progress.** Edited by CHARLES A. BEARD. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$3.00.

Charles Beard has shown a knack of inducing the important and well known to contribute to his books but, just as in "Whither Mankind," some of the contributions to "A Century of Progress" are inspiring, while others are commonplace. As Beard states in his own excellent chapter on "Government and Law," "bold is the thinker who can determine whether particular incidents represent gains or losses for mankind." Many of the chapters emphasize materialistic progress as representing the entire gains for mankind, an incomplete answer to the question in the mind of the readers why, with all this progress, our civilization faces chaos. Waldemar Kaempffert's chapter on "Invention as a Social Manifestation" presents an entrancing and comprehensive picture of the "ingenious adaption to American needs" of the important

discoveries in transportation, communication, and power. His summary of the improvements in transportation, coupled with Edward Hungerford's "Transportation and Communication," gives a comprehensive view of the developments of the century in these fields. Frank O. Lowden analyzes the changes which have taken place in the rural districts and gives light on the difficulties faced by agriculture. He believes with the passing of the self-sufficing farm, specialization has been carried too far. He points to the wasting of fertile soil, destruction of forest, leaving barren land, erosion destroying fertility, and the cultivation of arid regions good only for grazing, as some of the major set-backs to agriculture in the last 100 years. William Green writing on labor, and H. Parker Willis on banking and finance, are not as frank in discussing the serious problems facing labor and finance as might be desired. Jane Addams' account of the "Process of Social Transformation" emphasizes the elimination of many social and industrial evils. Other contributors and their subjects are: Grace Abbott, "The Changing Position of Women"; Watson Davis, "The Advancement of Natural Science"; Fielding H. Garrison, "Medicine"; Fiske Kimball, "The Arts"; Charles H. Judd, "Education"; John Erskine, "Literature"; and Henry Ford, with Samuel Crowther, "Industry." J. L. O'S.

**History of Modern Thought: The English, Irish and Scotch Schools.** By MICHAEL J. MAHONY, S.J., PH.D., LL.D. New York: Fordham University Press.

This admirable book, a sequel to the same author's "Cartesianism," gives an excellent picture of the currents of thought from Locke to Kant. Only four authors are treated: Locke, Berkeley, Hume, and Kant. Father Mahony presents their philosophies with a clarity and piquancy that makes this excellent reading not only for the undergraduate but for the professional philosopher as well. The title of the book, however, is unfortunate. The history of modern thought did not stop with Kant. Almost one-half of the book is devoted to John Locke. One chapter and an appended essay are all that are given to Kant. Nevertheless, the book should be recommended to undergraduate students of philosophy in our colleges and universities. This, with the preceding volume of Father Mahony's on Descartes, will help them to understand the contradictory and chaotic character of modern thought. The book deserves better editing than it has received and it needs an index. W. J. McG.

**The End of Our Time.** By NICHOLAS BERDYAEV. New York: Sheed and Ward. \$2.25.

"The Renaissance began," says Berdyaev, "with the affirmation of man's creative individuality; it has ended with its denial. Man without God is no longer man: that is the religious meaning of the internal dialectic of modern history, the history of the grandeur and of the dissipation of humanist illusions." At the present time we witness the end of the period inaugurated by the Renaissance. We enter into a night, as Western civilization entered into a night with the advent of the Middle Ages. Berdyaev, a former Communist, but now an outstanding leader of the movement for spiritual regeneration among the young Russians in Paris, a believing member of the Orthodox Church, in close communion of thought with Catholics, welcomes this "medieval night," which lent the title to the Russian work and its French translation, from which this English version is taken: "The New Middle Ages." With the disappearance of the individualistic age, contrary to general belief, real "individualities" will begin to appear. The "atomization" of society will end, and the real, universal values, rooted in Christianity, will appear. During this night we shall struggle finally with Bolshevism, which Berdyaev sees as a state or condition of society, rather than a movement: a degenerative affliction which has come upon modern society for its sins. Counter-revolution will not avail for its cure: "things would be worse, not better." There must be positive elements for regeneration,

and these are found only in religious life, in the unity of Christian belief, expressing itself in the united Christian will of the people. This thought Berdyaev expounds with extraordinary effectiveness and conviction; and a wealth of deeply Catholic sentiment. The least satisfying element in his doctrine is his unqualified denunciation of democracy. That democracy "knows nothing of a people's will" (page 180) is a proposition to be considered in the light of the historical traditions of each nation. Writing of Russia for Russians, it may hold as it stands, but is not of universal application. Berdyaev betrays some of the eccentricities of modern Orthodox thought in his drastic opposition of the supreme Will of God to the sinful will of the proletariat, where Catholic social ethics will find a middle ground. But with these minor defects, coupled with a somewhat over-prophetic tone, Berdyaev has given us a deep meditation on the present "crisis of culture." His message would be surer had he a better knowledge of the Humanity of Christ. J. L. F.

## BOOKS AND AUTHORS

**Learning to Pray.**—It would not seem like Christmas if another Series of that delicious, pocket-size manual of short meditations from the heart and pen of Father F. P. LeBuffe, S.J., did not make its appearance. Happily the Eighteenth Series of "My Changeless Friend" (Messenger of the Sacred Heart, New York. 30 cents) is already on its way to bring strength and courage and love and trust to those who are struggling to cling to Christ through the discouraging fogs and storms of life. Thousands have discovered a changeless friend in these heart-stirring booklets.

For those who find consolation and peace in the practice of the Second Method of Prayer so helpfully proposed in the "Teach Us to Pray Series," Father LeBuffe has prepared a Fourth Series "Creed—Confiteor" (America Press. 30 cents) which leads one through a multitude of reflections connected with each phrase of the Apostles' Creed. The simple dry words of the text become a fountain of living waters tumbling down through the channels of the Old and New Testaments, the liturgy of the Church, and the reflections of the author. The Series will be relished by all who aspire to the art of mental prayer.

**Delight and Disgust in Russia.**—In "The Great Offensive" (Smith and Haas. \$3.00) Maurice Hindus depicts the triumph of the "new man" in Soviet Russia, and the influence of the machine. The tone is more distinctly propagandist than in the earlier works by the same author. Desire is more evident to convince the American reader that Soviet Russia is a wonderful and delightful place, with a glorious future, always and in every way so much happier than of yore. The aspersions of Huntington and Eckblaw on the limitations of Russia's natural resources are vigorously combated. But there are important testimonies to the industry and character of the "kulak," and other disputed matters. Hindus, discussing Protestantism in Russia, frankly punctures the usual theory that Russia's atheism is a revolt against the formalism of the old State Church. His bold assertion, on page 177, that the Bolshevik is "no pacifist" and longs for "violent overthrow" of existing governments contrasts strangely with his fervent declarations at the close of the book that world revolution is all forgotten; contrasts, too, with what Louis Fischer has recently said on this subject. Nor is it true that at the last Communist Congress in January, 1933, there were scarcely any references to world revolution (page 352).

Carveth Wells, compared with the experienced and highly informed Hindus, is but a casual traveler, writing in lighter vein. Yet his observations go to complete the record, and he witnessed some facts about the Russian famine. Having visited Russia with his wife with enthusiastic hopes—raised perhaps by some of the glowing literature on the subject—the Wells found they had somehow hit upon the seamy side. From the start, pretty nearly everything was broken-down or out of order, expressed in Russian



by the German word which is the title of his book: "Kapoot" (McBride. \$2.50). Some of Mr. Wells' descriptions *re* pig sties, flies, etc., had best not be read before meals.

Unpleasant impressions created by Carveth Wells will be promptly dispelled by the delighted Irina Skariatina, otherwise Mrs. Victor Blakeslee, a high-born member of the old Russian aristocracy who returned to the land of her ancestors for to see and for to admire everything that the Soviet Government, which, we are informed, pronounced her perfectly safe to admit, undertook to show. In "First to Go Back" (Bobbs-Merrill. \$2.75), the entomological question is more delicately and hopefully handled by the lady author than by the blunt American. Besides, she took along some Flit. Like him, she was discreetly hurried through the famine regions of the North Caucasus and Ukraine, up to view the oddities of the Khevsurs in their mountain fastnesses where expectant mothers are exiled to stone huts. Official explanations are politely offered her of "persecution"; and any rare approach to tactless inquisitiveness on the part of Mr. Blakeslee neatly disposed of. The book is another output in the business of advertising Soviet Russia.

**Travel Books.**—"Discovering Christopher Columbus" (Macmillan. \$3.00), by Charlotte Brewster Jordan, is a delightfully interesting travel book on Spain and an equally interesting book on Christopher Columbus. That combination, cleverly devised and carried through by the author, gives us a remarkable piece of work. Christopher, a real American boy, goes to Spain with his uncle on a business trip. The uncle did his work and the boy did his—seeing Spain through the landmarks of Columbus. This plan started the youngster at Granada, and took him to Barcelona, Montserrat, Madrid, Toledo, Cordova, Seville, and finally to Palos, whence he sailed back as his great namesake had done almost five centuries before. Each of these Columbus landmarks supplies a worth-while chapter of the book. The fact that the volume is published by the Macmillan Company is proof of an attractive and well-made book.

**Books Received.**—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

ART AND ARTIFICE IN SHAKESPEARE, Elmer Edgar Stoll. \$2.50. Macmillan.  
 BEARNA BAOGHAIL, "Rory O'More." Talbot Press.  
 BIG TREE OF BUNLAHY, THE, Padraic Colum. \$2.25. Macmillan.  
 BORIS GODUNOV, Stephen Graham. \$2.50. Yale University Press.  
 CHRISTIANITY AND CLASS WAR, Nicholas Berdyaev. \$1.50. Sheed and Ward.  
 CHRISTMAS TREE, Lady Eleanor Smith. \$2.50. Bobbs-Merrill.  
 COWBOY FROM ALAMOS, THE, Charles H. Snow. \$2.00. Macrae-Smith.  
 CREED CONFITEOR, Francis P. LeBuffe, S.J. 30 cents. America Press.  
 CRITICISMOLOGY, Paul J. Glenn, S.T.D. \$1.75. Herder.  
 DOCTOR'S FIRST MURDER, THE, Robert Hare. \$2.00. Longmans, Green.  
 EXPLORING THE EARTH AND ITS LIFE, James L. McCreery. \$1.75. Stokes.  
 FIDDLER OF LOURDES, John Gibbons. 3/6. Burns, Oates, and Washbourne.  
 FRÉDÉRIC OZANAM AND HIS SOCIETY, J. Brodrick, S.J. 1/. Burns, Oates, and Washbourne.  
 GAY SOEURETTE, Ada Claire Darby. \$1.75. Stokes.  
 GLORY, Francis Stuart. \$2.00. Macmillan.  
 GREAT TRADITION, THE, Granville Hicks. \$2.50. Macmillan.  
 HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES, VOL. XXIII, Edited by Thomas F. Meehan. United States Catholic Historical Society.  
 IDEA OF GOD IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN PERSONAL IDEALISM, THE, Gerald T. Baskfield, S.T.L. Catholic University.  
 MARTIN LUTHER, Abram Lipsky. \$3.00. Stokes.  
 MARY OF NAZARETH, Mary Borden. \$2.50. Doubleday, Doran.  
 MASTER MURDERER, THE, Carolyn Wells. \$2.00. Lippincott.  
 MURDER DAY BY DAY, Irvin S. Cobb. \$2.00. Bobbs-Merrill.  
 NEW TESTAMENT, THE: VOL. II, PART II. \$2.60. Longmans, Green.  
 OLD MAN DIES, THE, Elizabeth Sprigge. \$2.50. Macmillan.  
 PRECIOUS JEOPARDY, Lloyd C. Douglas. \$1.00. Houghton Mifflin.  
 PRIVATE LIFE OF SHERLOCK HOLMES, THE, Vincent Starrett. \$2.00. Macmillan.  
 ROOSEVELT REVOLUTION, THE, Ernest K. Lindley. \$2.50. Viking.  
 SEX IN CHILDHOOD, Ernest R. and Gladys H. Groves. \$3.00. Macaulay.  
 SPIRIT OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT, THE, Christopher Dawson. \$1.50. Sheed and Ward.  
 STUDY OF RURAL PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, A. Edited by Allen W. Freeman. \$2.50. Commonwealth Fund.  
 TEXAS RANGE RIDER, THE, George M. Johnson. \$2.00. Clode.  
 THOMAS MORE, Daniel Sargent. \$2.50. Sheed and Ward.  
 TO WHOM SHALL WE GO? Rev. Frederick Macdonnell, S.J. \$1.25. Benziger.  
 TRAVELING WITH THE BIRDS, Rudyerd Boulton. \$1.50. Donohue.  
 USE OF POETRY AND THE USE OF CRITICISM, THE, T. S. Eliot. \$2.00. Harvard University Press.  
 WHAT I LIKE, William Lyon Phelps. \$2.75. Scribner's.  
 WHERE IS MY MOTHER? Charles Gilmore Kerley. \$2.00. Smith and Haas.  
 WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR, Phillips Russell. \$3.00. Scribner's.  
 WORLD ADRIPT, THE, Raymond Leslie Buell. 50 cents. World Peace Foundation.

**Gipsy Waggon. The Ex-Detective. Worth Remembering. Bonfire.**

Americans interested in post-War England will relish Sheila Kaye-Smith's latest novel "Gipsy Waggon" (Harper. \$2.50), a bright, intelligent, delicately realistic story of the deterioration of English agriculture and the problems today facing English farmers and farm laborers. Without prejudice and without indignation this brilliant Catholic writer describes the losing fight now being waged by those who cling tenaciously to English soil. The farmer, unable to subsist on falling prices, is compelled either to turn his acres into pasture or sell them for new building sites to encroaching city-dwellers. In either event, the farm laborer is forced out of his job, or if he succeeds in holding it for a time, he must accept the only stipend his impoverished farm employer can afford, a wage below any decent standard of living. All this is told in vivid characterization with a colorful setting in rural southeastern England. Throughout the book the writer shows intimate familiarity with her subject and a thorough awareness of the changed conditions of modern life. Toward the end of the narrative, Fred Sinden, the ploughman protagonist, is offered a ploughman's job by his neighbor, Jim Parrish, a gentleman farmer. It is Fred's rightful job, as it was his father's and grandfather's. But now in a spirit of strange freedom, acquired through long and bitter suffering, he takes to a gypsy wagon and, with his wife Ivy and their three children, wanders about the countryside as a nomad in the joy of new independence.

E. Phillips Oppenheim has created a new character in Malcolm Gossett who is "The Ex-Detective" (Little, Brown. \$2.00). Gossett leaves Scotland Yard to be a private investigator, and thus to be in a position to defend or assist those wrongly accused of crime. In this volume the author has related a series of Gossett's adventures, which are all interesting, and some exciting. This is the best of Mr. Oppenheim's recent books.

One ought to have been born and bred below Mason and Dixon's line really to appreciate the flavor of "Worth Remembering" (Longmans, Green. \$2.00). Rhys James it is who tells us of the daily escapades of Bunnypie, Biddy, and Bud. Above all it is the story of how Mammy tries to raise the incorrigibles and run the house at the same time. To the Colonel, their father, his children are simply an enigma. On the jacket it is stated that it is "A novel for adults only." That is quite true, for the youngsters would not understand it. However, most adults, especially those who have children of their own, will be disgusted with the utter lack of lovable qualities in these children who have been allowed to grow up like weeds with the "hands" as their only companions, for they seem to have been outlawed by the children of the neighborhood. Therefore one does not wonder at the profanity, and at times blasphemy, indulged in by the triumvirate.

The scene of the story in "Bonfire" (Harcourt, Brace. \$2.50), by Dorothy Canfield, is a little village in Vermont. The bonfire which is supposed to have spread over this village and transformed—for better or for worse—most of the characters of the book, is an uncouth, ignorant, but strangely seductive girl who comes down from the neighboring mountains to dwell as a maid of all work in one of the village families. While filling this post of duty, she is transformed in truly wondrous ways. She learns to talk, walk, dress, and conduct herself in general as would a lady of patrician ancestry. She then marries a young doctor of the village, drives him to drink and the ruin of his practice by exercising her powers of seduction on other men—and at the story's close runs away from the village with a very poor specimen of a man. The book has power; the pen sketches of character and of incident are worthy of real praise; and one can well understand how some critics might even go to the extreme of the blurb, and style the book a "stirring drama of living." But taken as a whole it is dull. If the book is to be taken as "an artistic piece of realism," and if the inhabitants of this village are typical citizens of Vermont, we would not care to live in their midst. The author has not been at all complimentary to the people of her native State.

## Communications

*Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.*

### Jogues' Torture

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have hesitated to write to you about the article in AMERICA for October 7, "Jogues' Torture on Crown Point," thinking that some one more competent might have a word or two to say about Jogues' torture on Jogues' Island. Your writer certainly spared no effort to trace the Lake torture trail of Jogues and his companions, and his computation of the distances covered each day is most interesting and plausible.

It is to be feared however that he hugged too close to shore, or perhaps napped, like the Homer that he has the makings of, and overlooked the island south of Westport, known as "Jogues Island," on which, tradition has it, Jogues and his French and Indians suffered their first wholesale torture. For fully a half century, or more, this tradition has persisted among us lake-dwellers, and it seems to accord with the testimony of Jogues himself—to be the "small island" he spoke of to his intimate friend, Father Buteux, on which he and his companions were tortured.

I recall when Father Campbell passed this way laden with his material for "The Pioneer Priests of North America," (now out of print, and the more's the pity) of which the Jogues sketch was the first chapter. The island was there then and it is still there, State owned and ready for the memorial to the martyr and his heroic band, which their admirers, regardless of belief, hope some day to erect to their memory on soil bedewed with their blood.

Here is an enterprise for AMERICA and the writer who would immortalize the memory of two of the first Saints enrolled in our American calendar and their companions, every bit as holy as they.

Near Jogues' Island,  
Lake Champlain, N. Y.

LACENSIS.

### Disarm the Munitions Makers

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The issue of AMERICA for June 3 carried an article from my pen entitled "Disarm the Munitions Makers!" This article has been cited for dishonorable mention in *Army Ordnance* for October, 1933. Four exhibits of "Pacifism" are catalogued by the editor of that publication. He quotes excerpts from my article and appends a parenthetical query: "Has it ever occurred to the good pedant that before an American munitions ring can continue to bully there must first be an American munitions ring? Teachers of history are presumed to deal in facts—not fancy."

Similar elegant shots are fired at Dr. Woolley, of Mount Holyoke College, Beverly Nichols, and Fenner Brockway. *Army Ordnance* is not a Government publication; it is a "Bimonthly Review of American Munitions," sponsored by the Army Ordnance Association. This patriotic body is working for peace insurance by keeping American armament up to snuff. I do not quarrel with its avowed aims. But when it derides champions of mutual disarmament, a few words of comment seem necessary.

First: My article was a mosaic of quotations. I cited among other authors Earl Grey, Mr. Baldwin, several Popes, a report of the League of Nations Commission of 1921, M. Hoog of "La Jeune République," and the very propaganda of foreign armament firms in support of my assertions. Query: Are all my authorities "pedants"?

Second: It is rather clear *a priori* that unrestricted armament

competition is a menace to world peace. *A posteriori* a mass of evidence shows that such competition was a prime cause of the debacle of 1914. Lowes Dickinson has shown this in his work, "The International Anarchy." He cites a great mass of evidence in support of his statements. But he is a "pedant" no doubt. Today, in all advanced countries, a great vested interest exists whose very life blood is armament competition, and which waxes fat on war. *Army Ordnance* proves this. It jeers at all efforts to restrict armament competition, and boasts that it takes a realistic view of world affairs. "Leaders of thought in academic and literary circles might well stick to their knitting." The professor "should not venture into a field in which he is not expert at all." Hence professors (and I presume Popes) are out of court. Let us leave the problem of disarmament to the unbiased judgment of armament makers and their henchmen. Query: Would one consult Brigham Young concerning clerical celibacy?

Third: The thesis I maintained was simple: "Divorce private profit from war." Is private profit from war and armament a benefit or a menace to peace? I leave the answer to the readers of AMERICA.

Fourth: I said nothing in my article about an American munitions ring. I merely mentioned that several American corporations made munitions. My targets were European armament concerns. Hence a query: Why the solicitude for Vickers-Armstrong, Schneider-Creusot, and others on the part of *Army Ordnance*? Is it a guilty conscience?

Fifth: I commend to Catholics the following citations: Benedict XV: "A just agreement by all for the simultaneous and reciprocal diminution of armaments is necessary for the support of public order." Pius XI: "The unbridled race of armaments." "The two evils of hostility and waste are largely due to the excessive and increasing competition in the output of implements of war." Compare these with the policy of *Army Ordnance* and take your choice.

In conclusion, I am no sloppy pacifist. I believe in an Army and Navy adequate for legitimate defense. I also know that unless real and reciprocal limitation of armaments be attained, war seems inevitable. I contend that the existence of a great industry which takes profit from competitive armament and derives gain from war is a menace to the cause of peace.

Yet I think *Army Ordnance* is helping the good cause. Let it sneer at the friends of peace, let it scoff at the possibility of armament limitation. It thus reveals the mentality produced by those who share in dividends of death, and thus stresses the need of separating once and for all profit from havoc.

New York.

LAURENCE K. PATTERSON, S.J.

### The Campaign for Social Justice

To the Editor of AMERICA:

There are absolutely no grounds for being appalled at the attitude of our colleges and college graduates toward the social principles of Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XI. Never before have the former given such evidence of appreciating their respective responsibilities in the face of persistent economic distress as today.

It is most unfair to cast strictures upon the faculties and students of our higher institutions of learning for their enthusiastic support of football. Football provides a wholesome topic for conversation, and affords an innocuous source of recreation for our young men who otherwise would probably be less judiciously employed.

Within the past few years conferences on social justice have been convened in increasing number at centers of Catholic culture throughout the country. I recall a distinguished symposium on this subject conducted by the undergraduates of Fordham two years ago in the presence of representatives of other Catholic colleges, with Messrs. Moody and Woodlock as guests of honor for the occasion. Less than a month ago I read of a seminar on



social problems held under the auspices of the alumni of St. John's College of Brooklyn.

Two monthly organs of this comparatively new Catholic social movement in the United States have been instituted and already are beginning to thrive. Graduates of Catholic colleges are now regularly engaged in expounding the doctrines of the Church on labor and a living wage at the juncture of Wall and Nassau Streets, New York City. Catholic guilds are constantly being formed for the organized study of our pressing economic concerns with the view of orienting relations between employer and worker and thus preventing the recurrence of our present catastrophic conditions.

Surely your correspondent has no reason to be appalled at the vital interest everywhere manifested by Catholic intellectuals in the problems of the day. Perhaps if he would devote his effervescent spirit to a constructive furthering of these far-flung efforts, he would find in his ensuing contacts with socially minded, educated Catholics a complete refutation of his unwise contentions.

Brooklyn.

PATRICK F. CASEY.

### Teeth and Diet

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May I reply to Mr. Sellmeyer's query (AMERICA, October 14, 1933) that all I hoped to do was to make people realize that instead of deceiving ourselves with supposed tooth protection by means of an illusory toothbrush, special care should be taken of the diet so as to enable the teeth to resist invasion by microbes. There are 33,500,000 children in this country under fifteen years of age. According to the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, ninety-five per cent of these or over 30,000,000 of our school children suffer from dental caries. This is the generation that has been trained in the use of the toothbrush. They have had toothbrush drills of all kinds in school and in social settlements, and yet more than nineteen out of every twenty children have carious teeth. A couple of glasses of milk taken every day mean more for the preservation of the teeth than all the toothbrush scrubbing that could be done. There are other suggestions as to diet that might be made but they are dependent on the individual needs. We have practised many deceptions on ourselves in medicine during the past 300 years, but none of them has been more flagrant than the use of the toothbrush. Tooth preservation comes from within and not from without.

New York.

JAMES J. WALSH.

### Broadcasts from Russia?

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The following was taken from the *New York Times*, Sunday, Oct. 8, 1933, in an obscure corner:

#### ANTICIPATING RECOGNITION

##### NBC TESTS WITH RUSSIA

Short-wave tests with Russia are being conducted by the National Broadcasting Company. An extensive series of programs is planned providing the United States recognizes the Soviet, according to a representative of the company.

"Reception has been excellent for the past three weeks," he said, "and the tests most satisfactory, indicating we will have no difficulty in intercepting and rebroadcasting music and talks from Russia. We are anticipating recognition."

May a few pertinent questions be asked? What will be broadcast from Russia? Will these programs contain Communistic principles destructive of our American government and of Christian morality? Is Bolshevism, after having been so successfully repulsed from our shores, at last to enter the United States, to enter our American homes by means of radio rebroadcasts issuing from a broadcasting company which is staunchly American? Is this a possible Bolshevik method of violating a possible section of a possible treaty of recognition of Russia by the United States, that no Communistic propaganda be spread in the United States consequent on this possible recognition? And finally, the most ticklish question of all, who will pay for these rebroadcasts, which,

as we all know, will be rather expensive? And what might be the ultimate motive for all this expense?

Weston, Mass.

C. E. LYNCH, S.J.

### "With a Philanthropical Jimmy"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the issue of AMERICA for October 6, under the department of Sociology, Father Blakely gives advice to the housewife which all of us must heed if the sound Catholic principles of social justice are to be given practical application in a world that is coming more and more to be governed by economic forces.

But if it is expected of the housewife that she look to the economics behind every bargain sale to see if along the whole gamut from producer to consumer justice has been done, what then must we expect of the Bishops when the Church confers honors upon its prominent laymen? These honors often have come to Catholic captains of industry who have made generous contributions. Is it too much to ask that the Church demand proof from these Catholic employers of labor that the conditions of work and of pay in the industries under their control conform in spirit to the memorable Encyclicals of Leo and of Pius?

Too many of us feel that honors have been lightly given to those who have made contributions in the hope of prying their way into the pearly gates with a philanthropical jimmy.

Omaha.

JOHN R. ROSS.

### Appeal for Lepers

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Each year at this time the holy missionary priests and nuns in charge of the Catholic Leper Colonies stretch out eager hands to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith for an alms which will brighten Christmas for their poor charges, the lepers—the poorest of Christ's flock.

Even through these trying times, we are straining every effort to make Christmas cheerful for those we love. Let us not forget our fellow men who live in the hopeless grasp of loathsome leprosy and whose lives are deprived of every solace except that which Religion affords. These most miserable of outcasts have not been abandoned by the missionary priests and nuns, who in widely scattered parts of the world, follow in the footsteps of the immortal Father Damien. But they need funds to help them care for their charges.

This year there is indeed great need at home. Yet even the poor feel less the pinch of their poverty when they share with those who are in even greater need than themselves. Surely those who read this may be moved to send a mite to the "human derelicts" who will be happy to receive the crumbs of our Christmas charity and will repay the donors by holy prayers at the Crib on Christmas morning.

Offerings for the Lepers' Christmas Fund may be sent to the Diocesan Director of the Society (in every diocese) or to the undersigned at 109 East 38th St., New York City.

New York.

RT. REV. MSGR. WILLIAM QUINN, P. A.

National Director, S. P. F.

### Remail to the Seamen

To the Editor of AMERICA:

For the benefit of the many Catholic officers and seamen of the numerous foreign steamship lines engaged in the passenger and freight traffic stopping at the Port of Hamburg, such as the United States Lines, the Baltimore Mail Line etc., we maintain a Catholic Seamen's Home.

It would be a great help for our work if your readers would be kind enough to remail to us any copies of your valuable AMERICA or similar magazines for the use of our English speaking guests in our Catholic Seamen's Home.

Kindly address your supplies to the undersigned, the Port Chaplain, Hafenstrasse 93.

Hamburg, Germany.

H. A. REINHOLD.

## Chronicle

**Home News.**—Secretary of the Treasury Woodin on November 15 was granted an indefinite leave of absence by President Roosevelt, in order that he might recuperate from a serious illness. He had asked on October 31 to be allowed to resign, but the President had declined to accept the resignation. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, was named Acting Secretary of the Treasury. Dean Acheson, Under-Secretary of the Treasury and Acting Secretary in Mr. Woodin's absence, resigned his position. He was reported to have been opposed to the fiscal policies of the President. The first Civil Works Conference met in Washington on November 15, with 500 delegates present. President Roosevelt informed them that neither politics nor graft would be allowed to interfere with the new program, and assured the cooperation of the Federal Government in speedily putting the plan into effect. In another address, Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator of the civil-works program, said that it was proposed to allot the jobs on the basis of seventy-five per cent according to population and twenty-five-per-cent unemployment or relief needs. On November 15 Secretary of Commerce Roper announced that the Public Works Administration had agreed to allocate \$1,500,000 for immediate experiments with floating landing fields for airplanes. A quarter-section will be built first, and if it stands service tests, allocation will be made from the public-works fund for a full drome, costing \$6,000,000. Contingent upon the success of this is a tacit agreement by the Administration to build and equip five, to be strung at 500-mile intervals from the Atlantic seaboard to the western coast of Europe, according to the plans of Edward R. Armstrong, the inventor, for the establishment of a commercial airway. General Johnson returned to Washington from his Mid-West speaking tour on November 15, and reported to the President that his trip was a complete success. He found, however, that there must be much stricter compliance with the codes and agreements. Complaints of profiteering under the codes and Blue Eagle agreements will be presented at public hearings beginning December 12. Secretary of Agriculture Wallace made three speeches defending the Administration's course in farm relief. He spoke at Des Moines on November 11, Chicago on November 13, and Muncie, Ind., November 14. On November 11, Controller General McCarl ruled that the Ford Motor Company was eligible for Government contracts, holding that Mr. Ford and his agents must be considered legitimate bidders until the NRA has presented proof of code violation. Secretary of State Cordell Hull sailed from New York on November 11, en route to the coming Pan-American conference at Montevideo. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee continued its investigations into banking practices. On November 14, the House Immigration and Naturalization Committee opened an informal investigation of alleged Nazi propaganda.

**Roosevelt Confers With Litvinov.**—Complete silence was maintained on the purport of the conversations in Washington on recognition of Russia. After postponing his first conference with the Soviet envoy, Maxim Litvinov, until the latter had completed a series of preliminary discussions with officials of the State Department, President Roosevelt talked with him for three hours on the evening of November 10. After referring M. Litvinov to the State Department for further negotiations, the President called him unexpectedly late in the evening of November 12 for a two-hour conference. Great surprise was expressed in Moscow that President Roosevelt wished first to establish the conditions for recognition and had reversed the procedure that the Soviet Government had always proclaimed itself as inexorable in maintaining, and which M. Litvinov had assumed would be followed in Washington: that relations would first be established and the problems for adjustment between the respective Governments would be remanded till afterwards, presumably for treatment by a mixed commission; in other words, that Mr. Roosevelt was apparently conducting a shrewd bargain. The President announced that he would leave for Warm Springs, Ga., on November 17. It appeared that if M. Litvinov wished further discussion, in case he had not found it possible to agree to the President's conditions by that time, he might have the opportunity to do so given him at Warm Springs. Reports were also current that the personal security and the right to freedom of worship for Americans in Russia were demanded.

**Anti-Recognition Protests.**—While the conversations in Washington were in progress, the volume and intensity of anti-recognition protests were gradually increasing. In a 187-page document, William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, presented to the President the reasons for that body's unalterable opposition to Russian recognition maintained since 1921. Speaking at Arlington National Cemetery on Armistice Day, November 11, Edward A. Hayes, National Commander of the American Legion, denounced the recognition of Soviet Russia in the name of the American Legion. The National Association of American Manufacturers circularized its members with data to the effect that the post-War trade with unrecognized Russia was greater than it had been with Russia before the Revolution. Senator Hatfield of West Virginia issued a statement condemning recognition. Hamilton Fish, ranking Republican member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, threatened to make the granting of recognition a major issue for the Republican party in the next presidential campaign. On November 15, Simon Demydchuk, President of the Ukrainian United Organizations, presented to the President a bitter protest from his groups, on the matter of the Russian famine and the oppression and the extermination of the Ukrainian people by the existing regime. In the meanwhile, cogency was lent both to the recognition talks and to the protests by the reports from the Far East that the Japanese had flown planes over Russian territory and the counter-report that two Japanese military planes had been



shot down by the Red army. Both reports met with denials by the respective Governments accused; but they increased the Russo-Japanese tension.

**Cuban Revolt Quelled.**—The revolt against President Grau's student-army Government collapsed on November 9 after an artillery battle in which nearly 200 were killed and more than 250 wounded, the largest revolutionary toll in the history of the Republic. The rebels, besieged in Altares Castle, surrendered only after six hours of heavy bombardment by combined military and naval forces. Many other rebels were thought to have escaped at dawn from Altares into the interior, presumably to join the movement outside of Havana to restore Dr. Cespedes to the Presidency. Spokesmen for the defeated rebels admitted they had planned assaults on American property with the hope that this would bring about intervention by the United States. Trial by court martial of captured rebel leaders began on November 11. Though the ABC and other revolutionary factions sustained a severe blow in the fall of Altares, many of them still in Havana expressed the opinion that the rebellion was far from ended. On November 12, outbreaks were reported in Santiago, Camaguey, Santa Clara, and various other points in the interior.

**Germany Supports Hitler.**—The elections in Germany on November 12 went off quietly, with the result anticipated by all commentators. About 43,400,000 voters out of a possible 44,400,000 went to the polls in good humor; and in the final count 95.5 per cent had voted "yes" to the Hitler program. The figures stood at 39,655,288 against 3,352,289. The negative votes were declared defective. It was clear that Hitler had almost unanimous support for his foreign policy, particularly in regard to the League of Nations, and the membership of the new Reichstag would be the carefully selected leaders of Nazi activities who had been proposed by Hitler himself. The trial of the Reichstag incendiaries dragged on with indications that the results would be unsatisfactory so far as the Communists were concerned because of the lack of evidence. The court was taken by surprise when the silent Van der Lubbe suddenly became articulate. He told the details of his deed and claimed that he was the only one involved. Reports of disquieting conditions in regard to the treatment of Catholic non-political organizations and some prominent Catholic leaders made it evident that the Vatican-Reich Concordat had not brought the peace and stability that was promised for it. Catholics complained that the Nazi Government made no effort to carry out its part of the program, but in many instances had acted contrary to the spirit and even the letter of the law. Increasing tension was further seen in the arrest in Munich of Dr. Wilhelm Marx, several times Chancellor of Germany, Adam Stegerwald, former Labor Minister and leader of the Catholic Labor Union, with Dr. Heinrich Brauns, Dr. Frederick Dessauer, and Clemens Lammer on a charge of fraud in connection with their administration of the funds of the National Association for

Catholic Germany. Herr Dutmann, the former Nazi leader in the Bavarian Diet, hastened to Rome to straighten out the tangle but failed. It was reported that General Goering was in Rome attempting to handle the matter personally, but was unable to make contact with the Pope. Returning to Germany for the elections, Minister Goering was supposed to be preparing to return to Rome to prevent the Vatican from publicly denouncing the ineffective Concordat. Particularly were the Catholics of Bavaria very much upset by the turn of events under the Nazi rule.

**German Protestants Troubled.**—Not only were the Catholics straining under the Nazi totalitarian theory, but serious dissensions arose in the new unified German Evangelical organization. Besides the silent opposition of the devout minority that refused to permit the politicalizing of Christianity, recent evidence of bitter feuds among the German Christian leaders who had gained complete control of reorganized Protestantism indicated internal confusion and disorder. Two Protestant ministers, Rev. Martin Niemoller and Rev. E. F. von Raberman, were suddenly suspended for conflicts with features of Reichsbishop Mueller's policies; but on the eve of the elections the suspensions were lifted temporarily. Dr. Niemoller's strong contention that Christianity in Germany cannot be restricted to Aryans only, and that the clause prescribing anti-Semitism be expunged from the new charter developed a bitter debate, with the German Christian leaders standing resolutely for the anti-Semitism clause. In the Sportsplatz on November 13 prominent leaders of the German Christian party demanded the scrapping of Christian traditions and beliefs in favor of a German-made model, with the Old Testament discarded, the New Testament revamped, and the Crucifix abolished. The Reichsbishop immediately suspended the guilty parties, including Dr. Reinhold Krause and Dr. Joachim Hossenfelder.

**French Cabinet Totters.**—In a new vote on the direct question of confidence in the Government the majority stood behind Premier Sarraut, 394 to 144. Radicals and Socialists were linked together in the majority. Political writers, however, predicted the imminent fall of the Ministry, probably within a few days. They felt that as soon as the financial proposals came up for debate, the ancient enmity between Radicals and Socialists would break out anew, rendering it impossible for the Premier to retain his majority.

**Spanish Elections.**—Political observers agreed that a sharp reaction against the Government was inevitable in the elections which were to be held on November 19. The elections were to see the first popular vote since the fall of the Monarchy, and women were to cast their ballots for the first time. All parties waged strong campaigns, in which there was much violence. A general view of the situation showed workers and peasants grumbling over the great promises and small achievement of

the Republic, and the vested interests leaning towards a dictatorship as an extreme. No one, however, felt that there was any real danger to the Republic.

**Mussolini's Speech.**—International publicity was given to the long speech with which Premier Mussolini closed the Fall session of the National Council of Corporations on November 14. The address, which ranged over a wide variety of subjects, including political, economic, world, and local affairs, was extemporaneous, and received an enthusiastic response from the audience. The outstanding passage upon purely national topics was that in which the Premier prophesied, and even ordered, the end of the Chamber of Deputies. This legislative body, the Premier admitted, would again be elected next year, but when its five-year term had drawn to a close, it would then be supplanted by the National Council of Corporations. The Chamber, said Il Duce, "is anachronistic. It is extraneous to our mentality and to our fashion as Fascists." Thereupon the Premier began a long discussion of the history of Capitalism. He showed that the growth of industrial enterprises had gradually changed them from merely economic into social groups or organisms and had forced them, in times of trouble, to clamor for the help and intervention of the State. This compelled the State to abandon its old ideal of non-intervention, and the whole system, the Premier predicted, would, if forced any farther, develop into a system of State Socialism. Observers characterized the speech as "the funeral oration of Capitalism and liberal institutions"—a description that was helped by the fact that Signor Mussolini boldly invited other nations to adopt a form of the Corporative State.

**Argentina Restricts Imports.**—President Justo published a decree on November 10 which virtually limited imports from any foreign country to the value of goods exported to it from Argentina. The new decree officially put into effect the slogan, "Buy from those who buy from us." American business men frankly faced the fact that they were likely to be forced out of business, because all import trade was henceforth prohibited except upon the issuance of carefully restricted Government permits. This would reduce the United States to only seven-and-one-half per cent of Argentina's import trade, that being the proportion of exports now going to the United States.

**Palestine Curbs Immigration.**—After receiving a delegation of six Mayors of the leading cities of Palestine protesting the illicit Jewish immigration over the frontiers, Sir Arthur Grenfell Wauchope, the High Commissioner, issued a communique on November 14 outlining in detail the Government's decision regarding Jewish immigration. The principal measures adopted by the Government to prevent unauthorized settlers were: (1) fines, imprisonment, and deportation; (2) restriction of entry to the ports for third and fourth class Jewish immigrants; (3) admission of capitalist settlers limited to those possessing \$5,310 or more; (4) tourists must secure return tickets and deposit \$300 as guarantees, to be forfeited if they fail to leave

the country when their visas expire. Meanwhile the political members of the Jewish Agency Executive of Jerusalem issued a statement on November 15 denying Palestine's incapacity to absorb the Jewish immigrants. Vigorous protests were also issued against the decrees of deportation. The Agency pointed out that the shortage of Jewish labor in Palestine was a clear indication that the absorption of unauthorized Jews had not affected the country's economic position. The Government's new policy was shown to disregard the assurance given to Dr. Chaim Weizmann in 1931 by Prime Minister MacDonald.

**Future of Disarmament Proceedings.**—Whether or not the future of the disarmament movement would lie in the continuance of the conference, or in negotiations between the large Powers, remained an unsettled problem. Arthur Henderson's threat to resign from the presidency of the disarmament conference created surprise at Geneva, and was calculated to swing British public opinion away from the large-Power idea favored by Italy. The younger Cabinet members in Great Britain were reported as urging the return to the Conference of the British delegation, and the *London Times* joined in the popular demand, which included a distinguished delegation at Downing Street in the interests of disarmament. Prime Minister MacDonald and Sir John Simon, however, refused to be drawn into any commitment thereon. Mr. MacDonald, speaking at the Guildhall in London on November 9 appealed to the rulers of Germany to reenter the armament negotiations. Any such proposals, he said, would be received "sympathetically" by the British Government. The Italian Government made clear that the recent visit of Hermann Wilhelm Goering, German Aviation Minister to Premier Mussolini was not accompanied by any concrete proposals and gave no foundation for reexamining the armament problem. The steering committee of the conference renewed its tasks in Geneva. Sensational revelations were made in the Belgian Parliament concerning the findings of the report on German armaments of the Interallied Control Commission in 1927, which refused to declare Germany as having satisfied the disarmament clauses of the Treaty of Versailles.

Next week's issue will be the annual special autumn book number. Besides other features there will be the usual book list that readers have found so useful.

Elizabeth Jordan's monthly review of the stage was held over from this issue, but will appear next week.

As a striking evidence of how the Catholic printers had pushed their art before the end of the fifteenth century, Alan Devoe will contribute "The Romance of Old Books."

Those who are going to Buenos Aires' Eucharistic Congress next year will welcome E. Francis McDevitt's paper "Our Lady of Lujan."

Kevin Barry's memory has been traduced by enemies. Next week it will be defended by Patrick J. Carroll in "Kevin Barry's Secret."